DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 936	RC 015 503
TITLE	Rural Sociology: The Wisconsin Contribution, Current Status and Future Directions. Proceedings of the Anniversary Symposium of the Department of Rural Sociology. (50th, University of Wisconsin, Madison, May 8-9, 1982).
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Coll. of Agricultural and Life Sciences.
PUB DATE	Dec 83
NOTE	320p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Department of Rural Sociology, 1450 Linden Dr., Madison, WI 53706.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Departments; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Intellectual History; Leaders; Research Needs; *Rural Areas; *Rural Development; Sociology; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Commemorative Events; Faculty Publishing; Institutional History; *Rural Sociology; *University of Wisconsin Madison

ABSTRACT

Papers presented at a symposium commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Rural Sociology of the University of Wisconsin-Madison are collected in this volume. The first four papers--by Olaf Larson, Edward Moe, Daryl Hobbs, and Robert Gard--discuss the department's history, emphasizing the contributions of outstanding faculty members and the ongoing emphasis on extension, outreach, and research. The subsequent five papers address the current status and future of rural sociology. Don Dillman presents predictions and a recommended agenda for rural sociology research. Harriett Friedman discusses the expanding field of agrarian studies and political economy and its implication for rural sociology as a discipline. Stan Albrecht reviews the status and future of rural sociology from the perspective of a "Rural Sociology" editor. William Flinn reviews the role of rural sociology in international development activities, and Howard Newby gives a European scholar's perspective or rural sociology in the United States. The final section is a 75-page, comprehensive bibliography of publications by faculty and staff of the Department of Rural Sociology. Entries are organized under five headings: books; chapters in books, bulletins, and proceedings; journal articles; bulletins and published reports; and working papers. (JHZ)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

R3256

ED262936

Rural Sociology
The Wisconsin Contribution, Current Status and Future Directions

---

Proceedings
of the
50th Anniversary Symposium

Department of Rural Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Madison

1234567890
NOV 1985
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

RC015503

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dept. of Rural Sociology: University of Wisconsin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Rural Sociology
The Wisconsin Contribution, Current Status and Future Directions

Proceedings
of the
50th Anniversary Symposium
Department of Rural Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
May 8-9, 1981

Research Report R3256
Research Division
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences
University of Wisconsin-Madison
December, 1983

Second printing, 1985

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Introduction	iii
Symposium Program	ix
The Contributions of Wisconsin Rural Sociology: The Early Period, Olaf F. Larson	1
The Contributions of Wisconsin Rural Sociology: The Middle Period, Edward O. Moe	33
University of Wisconsin Department of Rural Sociology: Contributions of the 1970s, Daryl J. Hobbs	51
Reminiscences of Cultural Arts in Rural Sociology, Robert E. Gard	75
Rural Sociology Research: The Next Ten Years, Don A. Dillman	81
Agrarian Studies and Political Economy: Challenges for Rural Sociology, Harriet Friedmann	111
Rural Sociology: Its Status and Future as Reflected in *Rural Sociology*, Stan L. Albrecht	137
Rural Sociology and International Development, William L. Flinn	175
Rural Sociology in the United States: A European View, Howard Newby	205
Bibliography of the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison	229

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 50th Anniversary Symposium and these proceedings are the result of the efforts and enthusiasm of a number of people. Within the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin, three faculty members formed the symposium planning committee and devoted their efforts to ensuring that the event would be a memorable occasion both scholarly and sociable. The planning committee was comprised of Professors Glenn V. Fuguitt, Donald Johnson, and Marta Tienda. The local arrangements and coordination of all symposium events were carried out by Eleanor Cautley, Specialist in the Department of Rural Sociology. Additional assistance in preparation and in chairing symposium sessions came from all other faculty members in the Department of Rural Sociology as well as from Professor Emeritus Arthur Wileden.

The symposium was made possible in large part by funds generously granted by three sources at the University of Wisconsin-Madison: the Administrative Committee, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences; the Anonymous Fund; and the Graduate School Research Committee.

Professor Wileden compiled the bibliography of department publications through 1979, and Amy Glynn updated the bibliography under the supervision of Professor Fuguitt.

In addition to the major papers presented here, several discussants graciously gave their time and energy to the symposium sessions. Due to the regrettable constraints of time and printing costs, we cannot include their remarks in this volume. We do wish to acknowledge their

efforts, and call attention to their names listed in the symposium program printed herein.

INTRODUCTION

The papers included in this volume were presented at a two-day symposium commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Rural Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The occasion was on May 8-9, 1981 in Madison and was attended by a number of former students and faculty members along with current department members and friends. Although such occasions are always a time for nostalgia and an opportunity to greet old friends, we wanted the symposium to make a significant contribution to current work in rural sociology. Consequently, we invited several persons well-known for their work in the field to attend and present papers on the history, status and future of rural sociology.

Since the University of Wisconsin has played a major role in both the national and international development of the field, it seemed appropriate, and not just a matter of self congratulation, to include papers on the contributions of Wisconsin to rural sociology. The first four presentations of the symposium reviewed the history of rural sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison: Olaf Larson covered the early period from 1911 to 1941; Edward Moe the middle period up to 1970; and Daryl Hobbs the contributions of the 1970s. Robert E. Gard made the fourth presentation, in recognition of the importance of the cultural arts program for rural Wisconsin during the development of the department.

The subsequent five papers addressed the current status and future of the field. Don Dillman presented his predictions and agenda for rural sociology research over the next few years. Harriet Friedmann discussed the expanding field of agrarian studies and political economy and its challenges for rural sociology as a discipline. Stan Albrecht, who at the time of the symposium was editor of the journal Rural Sociology, reviewed the status and future of our subdiscipline as reflected from the pages of the journal. William Flinn, formerly a faculty member at the University of Wisconsin and currently director of MUCIA, the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Affairs, reviewed the role of rural sociology in international development activities. Howard Newby, a new member of the Wisconsin department from Great Britain, discussed the status of rural sociology in the United States from the perspective of a European scholar.

The final section of this volume is a bibliography of publications authored or coauthored by faculty and staff members in the Department of Rural Sociology, or in the Department of Agricultural Economics prior to the establishment of the department in 1930. Our effort has been to make this bibliography of Wisconsin work in rural sociology as complete as possible given limitations of time and information available.

Rural sociology at Wisconsin began more than 70 years ago in 1911 with the appointment of Charles J. Galpin in the Department of Agricultural Economics to teach and conduct research on rural life. Galpin moved to Washington to accept a position with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1920, at about the time that John H. Kolb joined the department. Arthur Wileden and E. L. Kirpatrick arrived during the 1920s and in 1930 the Department of Rural Sociology was established with Kolb as Chair.

In the early years, everyone did some Extension work but Wileden was primarily identified with this activity. During the 1930s and 1940s a number of outstanding people in the arts were brought to Wisconsin through the efforts of the Department as part of a program to enrich rural cultural life, including John Steuart Curry, Aaron Bohrod, and Robert Gard. Kolb's research activities included several restudies of Walworth County following up on Galpin's 1914 research on community structure there. Kolb also did a study and several restudies of rural neighborhood groups in Dane County throughout his career and engaged in national level work, particularly during the depression of the 1930s. In addition he spent time in a number of other countries and helped to establish rural sociology in Brazil.

Kirkpatrick worked in the areas of family and level of living. The work of George Hill, who joined the staff in 1935 and left in the 1950s, included population and resource relations in rural areas and the ethnic background of the people in Wisconsin. Other faculty members of that time included John Barton, who joined the department in 1939 and stayed until his retirement in 1962, and William Sewell, who arrived in 1946 and became chairman in the late 1940s. While most of Sewell's research efforts were in stratification, he brought a rigorous approach to research that influenced many graduate students in other subfields of sociology and rural sociology.

In the 1950s, Douglas Marshall, Eugene Wilkening, and Glenn Fuguitt were added to the faculty, which considerably expanded the department programs in areas such as farm family decision-making and practice adoption and population studies. Jim Copp and Murray Straus also were on the Wisconsin faculty for brief periods during this era.

Robert C. Clark came to Wisconsin in 1950 to serve as State Leader of the 4-H program with an academic appointment in the Department of Rural Sociology. He went on to become director of the National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study and was a full-time faculty member in Rural Sociology from 1968 to 1970.

Don Johnson, Eugene Havens and A. O. Haller were added in the 1960s along with William Flinn, now at Ohio State University. This was a period of rapid expansion in international work, building in part on the early efforts of Kolb. Other additions included W. Keith Warner, now at Brigham Young University, who made a major contribution while at Wisconsin to the study of rural organizations, and Gordon Bultena, now of Iowa State University, who did perhaps the first work in the department on outdoor recreation and natural resources. Jay Johnson was active in extension programming during his time here in the late 1960s.

In the last decade one-half of the present faculty were added, including Gene Summers, Tom Heberlein, Doris Slesinger, Marta Tienda and Howard Newby. Also, David Featherman, now in the Department of Sociology, was on the faculty between 1970 and 1978. The current faculty in the Department of Rural Sociology include the five mentioned above and Fuguitt, Haller, Havens, Donald Johnson and Wilkening.

Through the years the department has pioneered in many areas, as discussed in the papers by Larson, Moe and Hobbs. Currently the main emphases of work include the sociology of agriculture, demography, particularly applied population, stratification and personal well-being, natural resources and energy, and the community.

There has always been a strong emphasis on graduate teaching in rural sociology at Wisconsin. From the time of its establishment the department has had a joint graduate program with the Department of Sociology and this has been a very significant element of strength. Since 1930 there have been 163 Ph.D.s awarded to persons whose major professor was on the rural sociology faculty, and 71 of these were awarded since 1969. In addition there were many more M.S. students. There is also an undergraduate major within the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, with a current enrollment of about 40 students.

Extension and outreach continue to be strong components of the work in the department. Wileden devoted his career to this effort, and his pioneering activities in community development, prior to his retirement in 1966, led to the establishment of a strong extension program in this area, which now includes community development agents working throughout the state. The other major extension thrust in the department is the Applied Population Laboratory, established by Marshall in 1959. Marshall's applied research and publications on demographic trends in Wisconsin set the pattern for work that is carried on today in the department.

The Department of Rural Sociology has always been research oriented. The bibliography, which is the last section of this volume, reflects the scope and quality of department research and reveals the professional interests of present and former staff members. As the review articles indicate, these efforts include significant contributions and leadership in several subfields.

This brief overview of the history and current status of the department is intended to serve only as an introduction to the papers presented here. A more detailed history of the department prior to 1975 is found in the bulletin "Early History of the Department of Rural Sociology," by Arthur Wileden, available from the department.

An important conclusion to emphasize is that in many ways we consider ourselves to be a stronger and more coherent department now than at any time previously. The 50th Anniversary Symposium was not assembled to look back on a golden age or to merely congratulate ourselves. We believe these papers reflect the forward look of the department and of the field of rural sociology today. We hope that they will have a general value to the discipline, as it continues to move toward the realization of its potential as a social science subdiscipline and a knowledge base for addressing social concerns.

Glenn V. Fuguitt

PROGRAM

50th Anniversary Symposium
Department of Rural Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Madison

May 8-9, 1981
State Historical Society of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Friday, May 8

Welcome:	Glenn V. Fuguitt, Chair, Department of Rural Sociology Leo Walsh, Dean, College of Agricultural & Life Sciences
FIRST SESSION	The Contributions of Wisconsin Rural Sociology
Chair:	E.A. Wilkening, Department of Rural Sociology
Speakers:	Olaf F. Larson, Cornell University "The Contributions of Wisconsin Rural Sociology: The Early Period" Edward O. Moe, U.S. Department of Agriculture "The Contributions of Wisconsin Rural Sociology: The Middle Period" Daryl J. Hobbs, University of Missouri-Columbia "University of Wisconsin Department of Rural Sociology: Contributions of the 1970s" Robert E. Gard, University of Wisconsin-Extension "Reminiscences of Cultural Arts in Rural Sociology"
Discussants:	Arthur F. Wileden, Department of Rural Sociology (emeritus) William H. Sewell, Department of Sociology (emeritus)

Saturday, May 9

Welcome:	A. Eugene Havens, Incoming Chair, Department of Rural Sociology Stephen C. Smith, Associate Dean, School of Natural Resources
SECOND SESSION	Rural Sociology: Its Status and Future Directions
Chair:	Marta Tienda, Department of Rural Sociology

Speakers: Don A. Dillman, Washington State University
"Rural Sociology Research: The Next Ten Years"

Harriet B. Friedmann, University of Toronto
"Agrarian Studies and Political Economy: Challenges for Rural Sociology"

Discussants: Frederick Buttel, Cornell University
David Brown, SEA, U.S. Department of Agriculture

THIRD SESSION Rural Sociology Status and Directions (continued)

Chair: A.O. Haller, Department of Rural Sociology

Speakers: Stan L. Albrecht, Brigham Young University
"Rural Sociology: Its Status and Future as Reflected in Rural Sociology"

William L. Flinn, Ohio State University
"Rural Sociology and International Development"

Howard Newby, University of Wisconsin-Madison
"Rural Sociology in the United States: A European View"

Discussants: James H. Copp, Texas A & M University
Wava G. Haney, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, UW-Richland Center

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF WISCONSIN RURAL SOCIOLOGY -
THE EARLY PERIOD

by

Olaf F. Larson*

The "early period" of Wisconsin rural sociology is defined for the purposes of this paper as covering the thirty-year span from 1911 until the nation's entry into World War II. Until departmental status was gained in 1930, work in rural sociology was in the Department of Agricultural Economics.[1] The years before gaining this status correspond to the pioneering period -- the formative period, nationally, in the rise and development of rural sociology as one of the specialized fields of sociology. The 1930 date of origin of the new department corresponds with the first phase of what T. Lynn Smith (1957) described as the period of maturation in which rural sociology came of age.

The Contributors

As a reminder to ourselves we should recall the names of those who made contributions during the early period of rural sociology at Wisconsin, names well recognized by students of the field. In the order in which they commenced their appointments through the mid-1930s, we recall Charles J. Galpin, John H. Kolb, Arthur F.

---

*Professor Emeritus of Rural Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Wileden, Ellis L. Kirkpatrick, and George W. Hill. A complete listing for the early period would add the names of more than a dozen others who held some type of appointment for a year or more.[2]

Galpin took up a half-time appointment as lecturer on country life problems on October 1, 1911 in the Department of Agricultural Economics, itself newly-formed only three years earlier. In Dean Russell's letter to the University president recommending Galpin's appointment, the dean said it was expected that Galpin's teaching would be limited at first and that the larger portion of his time would be employed in research work on specific problems which they had in view (H.C. Taylor, 1948). Extension teaching was immediately included in Galpin's activities as shown by his annual report for the first year. In succeeding years, he continued to meet farm and village people in their own communities as he traveled the state; for him, "no place was too remote, too small" (Galpin, 1938:31). After eight years Galpin was persuaded by Henry C. Taylor to go to Washington, D.C., to head the new Division of Farm Life Studies which Taylor had been authorized to form in the Office of Farm Management -- the economic research arm of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Galpin thought, worked and taught during those eight poineering, and -- to quote H.C. Taylor (1948) -- "crusading" years at Wisconsin, in four main areas: (1) the human factors in agriculture, (2) group relatons in rural society, (3) social institutions and organizations, and (4) farmers and their farms (Kolb, 1948).

In 1921, two years after Galpin left, Kolb was appointed and given responsibility for the Rural Life section set up at that time in the Department of Agricultural Economics by Benjamin H. Hibbard, Taylor's successor as head of that department. Kolb, like Wileden, who joined the staff in 1924, remained at Wisconsin until retirement. It was under Kolb's chairmanship, from 1930 until 1949, that the Department of Rural Sociology so firmly established its world-wide recognition as an outstanding department.

The Setting

To help us get a better feel for the significance of the early period achievements let us review some elements of the broader setting[3] within which rural sociology at Wisconsin was launched and developed.

By February 1910 interest in the social aspects of country life had developed at the University to the point where the inner circles were disussing the idea of having a person in the College of Agriculture to work on the subject (H.C. Taylor, 1948). At the time, there was not even a trickle of federal funds designated for such work, and there were not even the beginnings of a specialized discipline or of a professional organization of rural sociologists. The first text in rural sociology (J.M. Gillette's Constructive Rural Sociology) would not be published until 1913. Aside from two doctoral dissertations done at Columbia University on rural communities[4] -- that they were on rural communities was, it seems, entirely accidental (Nelson, 1969:29) -- and aside from the almost entirely overlooked studies on Blacks in small communities,[5] little empirical research on rural life had been published. Prior to 1910 probably not more than a half-dozen colleges and universities, public and private, could definitely claim to be offering a course in rural sociology (Sanderson, 1917:181-208).[6] These courses emphasized the amelioration of social conditions in rural life. And, as of 1910, the U.S. Census did not provide a clear-cut count of the population living on farms.

At the time, the scale of group relations for rural people and for the institutions and agencies which served them was adapted to travel by horse and buggy. On farms work was done by horse, mule, and even ox-power, and with a lot of hand labor. In retrospect, this was to be recalled as a good time, economically, for farmers as a whole. As for the agricutural colleges, Wisconsin Dean H.L. Russell (1911:9-12) pointed out that the idea had long been current that their function was "...largely material -- to make two blades of grass grow where but one grew before, or to make more money to buy more land, to grow more corn to feed more hogs to sell, and buy more land." But he also noted, in opening Wisconsin's first country life conference in Februrary 1911, that the idea of service to other than the material aspects of agriculture was rapidly getting more and more emphasis.

In the first decade of the 1900s, forces for change in country life and in farming were indeed being generated which would not be stayed. For example, the oft-lamented social isolation of the farm family was being reduced. Rural free delivery of mail passed beyond the demonstration stage. A USDA investigation in 1907 found 15,000 cooperatives engaged in providing telephone service to farmers (Eyerly, 1912:59). Automobiles were beginning to appear and would provide the impetus for a push for good roads. A few farmers were trying tractors in their fields.

An interest in the study and improvement of social and economic conditions in the country began to be shown. This interest was brought into focus and given momentum by the Report of President Theodore Roosevelt's Commission on Country Life, published in 1909 and republished several times (U.S. Congress, 1909). The Commission's inquiry was into the general social, economic, sanitary, educational and labor conditions of the open-country; it was directed at the farm, the farm family, the farm home, country neighborhoods and farmers' communities. The Commission identified a number of special deficiencies in country life (among them health in the open counry and woman's work on the farm) and made specific remedial recommendations for legislation or executive action by government, federal and state. Most importantly, the Report emphasized three great movements that should be set under way at the earliest possible time as fundamental to the whole problem of the reconstruction of country life. These were: (1) taking stock of country life, investigating with minute care all agricultural and country life conditions; (2) setting up a nationalized extension service, organized in each state by the college of agriculture to reach every person on the land with both information and inspiration; and (3) the launching of a great campaign for rural progress in which all interests, organizations and institutions with any interest in country life would unite, studying and discussing the rural question in all its aspects.

The Commission's Report is generally credited as the "first important milestone on the way to the establishment of the rural social sciences" (Nelson, 1969:12).[7] It sparked what came to be known as the country life movement, embracing a wide range of interests among which rural church and rural education interests were prominent. It stimulated the holding of numerous state country life conferences, among them Wisconsin's first conference held in February, 1911 under the auspices of the College of Agriculture. It was at this conference that Galpin (1911:12-18), not yet on the university staff, made the first public presentation of maps based on a survey he had made in Belleville, New York, which revealed the discovery of a rural community made up of village and open country, a community which did not correspond with any existing unit of government, a community which seemed to have a sort of social drainage basin with identifiable boundary lines. After the February 1911 conference Dean Russell was ready to employ a person to begin country life studies. It was Galpin's demonstrated originality which had convinced agricultural economist Henry C. Taylor (1948) that Galpin "would undertake more useful research and do more stimulating teaching" than anyone else he knew.

We will not dwell at great length on the events and changes in the broader setting within which Wisconsin's early period rural sociology developed. The fledgling field and its workers were directly helped by the already-noted establishment in 1919 of the Division of Farm Life Studies in the USDA, where Galpin judiciously used available funds "to plant rural sociological leaven at as many institutions as possible" (C.C. Taylor, 1948). Wisconsin was not overlooked; Kolb's first study of Dane County neighborhoods was a cooperative project. Among the other events with direct effects were (1) the establishment in 1924 of the Institute for Social and Religious Research which initiated a study of 140 village-centered agricultural communities, seven of which were in Wisconsin;[8] (2) the Purnell Act of 1925 which provided federal funds to state agricultural experiment stations which could be used for "such economic and sociological investigations as have for their purpose the development and the improvement of the rural home and rural life"; and (3) the formation of an independent Rural Sociological Society in 1937, an outgrowth of the rural section organized in 1921 within the American Sociological Society.

By the end of the period under review the nation had experienced World War I and its effects on rural areas, the agricultural depression of the 1920s which followed, the Great Depression of the 1930s and the associated enlarged role of government through a set of broad-ranging New Deal programs. By the end of the period, farming and country life were in sharp contrast technologically with that at the beginning -- we need to think only of the near-universal adoption and diffusion of the tractor, the automobile, all-weather roads and electricity. So, too, were there notable changes in the institutions, the services and group arrangements for farm and non-farm rural people.

Certainly there was an interaction between rural sociology at Wisconsin and these events and forces. If rural sociology described and recorded the organization and changes in rural society, it went beyond that to interpret the significance, to exercise some influence on the direction and type of change. It helped shape some of the events.

The Contributions

Any brief appraisal of the contributions represented by the 35 or so research and extension publications[9] produced during the early period in the name of rural sociology, and represented by the books authored or co-authored,[10] would be incomplete, although it is these to which I give major emphasis. Even if we could somehow know how these publications have been used -- how many people's ideas have been influenced, how many communities have been moved to take some action and what policies for rural people have been shaped in some way -- we would still have an incomplete story. We would have omitted mention of the contributions (1) in teaching and training, on-campus and off; and (2) to strengthening the discipline and the profession within the United States. We would have omitted the start of international contributions.

Teaching and Training. Most of Galpin's students at the university were in agricultural economics (Wileden, 1979:5; Galpin, 1938:30). His first graduate seminar, offered in the fall of 1915, was titled "Rural Social Development" (Kolb, 1931:2). As Wisconsin gained recognition as a major training center for graduate work in rural sociology,[11] his students[12] went on into key positions, especially in college and university teaching and research. Not to be overlooked is the undergraduate teaching, the teaching in the farm short courses at the university, in the annual school for rural pastors started in 1922 (Kolb, 1931:7; Wileden, 1979:51), and informal training and teaching in diverse locations within the state for a great range of country life groups. Neither should we neglect the fact that the Department of Rural Sociology was not only a base for extension activities in rural sociology but it provided a home base within the university for a set of activities not usually considered within the domain of sociology which benefitted the people of the state. Included here is the work in art, drama, music, recreation and public affairs discussion (Wileden, 1979:34-39).

The Discipline and the Profession. Galpin or Kolb was involved in virtually every development of significance in the early period for advancing the study of rural society and upgrading the quality of the research. It was while Galpin was at Wisconsin that he launched his battle for a clear-cut count by the U.S. Census of the farm population (1918:359-361), thereby enabling an analysis of the demographic characteristics of the farm population and opening the way to comparisons with the rural nonfarm population. This was a battle won in Washington in time for the 1920 census. Following passage of the Purnell Act, Kolb was a member of the Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture set up in 1925 by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) to survey the research work being done in this field and the methods of research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

used. One result of this committee's efforts was that the SSRC secured a Rockefeller Foundation grant which supported fellowships for 106 persons during 1928-1933 to improve their training in rural sociology and agricultural economics (Schultz, 1941:307-316). Among other results was the preparation of some 20 Scope and Method publications issued by the SSRC on research in various subfields, e.g. rural organization, rural institutions, and rural population.[13] Kolb was one of the leaders in organizing a rural life section within the American Sociological Society in 1921, a member of the first editorial board of the journal Rural Sociology, and an organizer of the Rural Sociological Society in 1938 (Nelson, 1969:127-131). Almost as soon as the Federal Emergency Relief Administration was organized in 1933 by President Roosevelt's administration, E.L. Kirkpatrick was brought in from Wisconsin to be on the staff as rural relief advisor (Hobbs, Link, and Winston, 1938). One result was the working out of a "Plan for Cooperative Rural Research" which had an important effect on the development of rural sociology and rural research. Some 41 of the state agricultural experiment stations were involved in the Cooperative Plan under which nation-wide surveys and detailed studies of special problems of rural relief were made.[14] When a special rural section was organized within the research unit of FERA (later Works Progress Administration) in Washington, Kolb was one of the rural sociologists called in for a time (in 1935) as coordinator of rural research. Other examples of this type of contribution from Wisconsin could be cited.[15]

International. The forerunner of work by Wisconsin rural sociologists in other countries, as contibutors, was Kolb's advisory work with New Zealand's Bureau of Social Research in 1938 and in Australia.[16]

Central Themes in the Early Period

The published work of the early period was concerned with a number of substantive areas. Among the publications we find the long-acclaimed classics -- Galpin's The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community (1915), Kolb's Rural Primary Groups (1921), Kolb and Wileden's Special Interest Groups in Rural Society (1927). We find the first restudies which revealed changes and trends underway in the group arrangements in rural society, namely Kolb and Polson's Trends in Town-Country Relations (1933) -- a report on the first restudy in Walworth County -- and Kolb's Trends of Country Neighborhoods (1933), the first Dane County restudy. Among the many others we find Galpin's first bulletin, A Method of Making a Social Survey of a Rural Community, issued in 1912 when the field work for his Walworth County study was not yet completed. It was an extension-type publication, put out as a "Circular of Information" by the Agricultural Experiment Station, and must have been in demand because a second edition was issued within the year. Near the end of Galpin's tenure at Wisconsin the circular, Social Surveys of Rural School Districts: How Made and How Utilized was produced (1920 with G.W. Davies and Grace Wyman-Stone). These circulars exemplified the expansion of concerns of the College of Agriculture to include social conditions in country living.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What continuities, what central themes, if any, run through the set of research and extension publications, through the work of the early period? Or, to use one of Kolb's expressions, what was the "red thread"? I see two central, interrelated "red threads." The first was the effort to understand rural life, to gain knowledge of rural society through careful first-hand study and analysis. This first central theme might also be stated as the effort to build a science of rural society with that society being conceived of as made up of both farmers and nonfarmers in the open-country and in villages and small towns. The second "red thread" was putting into practice the "Wisconsin idea" that the educational responsibilities of the university are not bounded by the campus (Kolb, 1959:150). This second theme might also be expressed as carrying out the land-grant college mission of serving the people, or as the application of knowledge for the public good.

The interrelatedness of the two central themes comes through repeatedly. Galpin had no text book to fall back on for his classroom teaching. So on the one side he made first-hand observations in rural Wisconsin, collected 30,000 separate facts in that first Walworth County study, sought to find order in his observations in the collected facts, began to try to disentangle rural social forces, and attempted "to explain what was going on in rural life" (Kolb, 1948:133). On the other hand, from the first, Galpin met farm and village people in their own communities and told them what others were doing. He crusaded for a better country life, inspired the carrying out of social surveys, organized cooperatives and established community centers. If Part I of The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community described how the survey of Walworth County was made, presented the results in map form and suggested the theoretical form of the town-country community, Part II laid out the steps to realign farm and village into comprehensive communities in accord with their actual underlying relationships. In Rural Primary Groups, after Kolb had laid out the results of his study of Dane County neighborhoods -- with the theoretical underpinning provided by C.H. Cooley's primary group concept -- he ended with a section for which the opening sentence was: "Investigation and study should end in action." In this section he indicated the implications he saw in his findings for the organization of rural society: that any scheme of organization was questionable which deliberately left country neighborhood groups out of consideration. He identified implications for district schools and high schools, for national farmers' organizations, for country and village churches. Nearly every research bulletin included a section on implications of what was discovered. The analysis of 351 special interest organizations in five counties was reported by Kolb and Wileden in a lengthy research bulletin, Special Interest Groups in Rural Society. Practically all of these organizations reported difficulties of some sort or other. Accordingly, the authors produced an extension bulletin, Making Rural Organizations Effective (1928), on five methods suggested for overcoming the typical problems encountered by such organizations. The concluding sentence in a "Brief History of the Work in Rural Sociology at Wisconsin," prepared by Kolb in 1931, shortly after the new department came into being, emphasized the two central themes and their interrelatedness. It read: "The motive behind the research has been to help build the science and likewise to serve the state."

Contributions to Understanding Rural Society -- Some Illustrations. The research done by the early period rural sociologists at Wisconsin profoundly influenced our perception of the way in which rural society is organized in the United States, increased understanding of the changes underway in that society, and provided methods for the study of rural life. I have organized my selection of illustrations of these contributions within three major categories, namely (1) group arrangements and relationships, (2) changes and trends and (3) social factors in farming.

Group Arrangements and Relationships. During the early period the major emphasis was on identifying and characterizing the important types of group arrangements which existed in rural Wiscosnin, i.e. the locality groups -- community and neighborhood, the agencies and institutions which served rural people, the voluntary or special interest organizations, and the family.

Galpin decided, in his words, to try "a New York fly in Wisconsin waters" (1938:21-26), i.e. to adapt the method tried out in his Belleville study to determine farm family use of a set of eight services located in 12 Walworth County village, small city, and hamlet centers. He thought "the whole piece of research -- inception, technique, interpretation -- ... fairly simple...." But when E.A. Ross saw the manuscript of the Social Anatomy of a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rural Community his evaluation was that it was "as much a discovery as sighting a planet." This work by Galpin came to be regarded as a major discovery in the field of the rural social sciences. Dean Russell would write that Galpin had opened "...a fresh vein of thought that bids fair to be a mine of increasing richness in that it offers a pertinent and tangible foundation for the molding of rural life, not on a basis of separate development where the city and country are unrelated to each other, but where the two forms of expression are mutually dependent on each other" (Galpin, 1918:ix-x). Galpin had tested a hypothesis "that trade was associated with other contacts in the formation of community relations" (Kolb, 1959:93) -- an index to a complex of farmer-village contacts out of which was created an actual, if not legal, fundamental community. Galpin's method of discovering the boundaries of the community "was a true social invention" (Nelson, 1969:37) to be used with relatively minor modifications by later investigators (Brunner, 1957:5). "For the first time," said Lowry Nelson, "it became possible to view the areas of rural association as discrete units." The method was adapted for use in the most urban of situations. Robert E. Park at the University of Chicago credited the Walworth County work as being the stimulus for his first studies of the ecological areas in the Chicago region (Kolb, 1948). And Galpin's study gave rise to the term "rurban" to designate some types of town and country relations.

The second pioneering contribution to understanding the locality groups in rural society was Kolb's study of neighborhoods. The presence of country neighborhoods had already been recognized by personal experiences. But it remained for Kolb to draw on Cooley's general primary group concept to formulate a working definition of a rural primary group as "that first grouping beyond the family which has social significance and which is conscious of some local unity" (1921:5-6), to wed this with a method of formally identifying active neighborhoods and establishing their boundaries.

Some erroneously concluded from Galpin's Walworth County study that the rural community made up of town and country was "completely self-sufficient, and almost inviolate" (Kolb, 1959:100). A series of later studies would point out the specialization of centers, the interdependence of centers ranging from the open-country or small hamlet neighborhood to the metropolitan center of 50,000 population or more -- systems of interrelatedness for the groups in rural society. Kolb's first Dane County study made a start in pointing out the tendency to differentiate among centers as country family contacts extended beyond the neighborhood. Service Relations of Town and Country (1923) identified five generalized types of service centers with differing degrees of completeness of service. Service Institutions for Town and Country (1925), in formulating the unit requirement principal for service institutions, specifically for the high school, the library and the hospital, demonstrated that different services had different requirements in population base and per capita costs and therefore had different geographic area requirements. The principal was based upon a division of labor; it meant specialization, that every community center could not provide all the services required.

A sensitivity to the interrelationships among social groups was evident from the first, especially the interrelationships between high school and community. "It would be difficult," wrote Galpin (1915:15), "to over estimate" the influence of the high school "as a form for constructive cooperation" between farm and village. The public high schools, however, were village and town institutions. Farm children were not included in the legal high school district areas. Not only the unit requirements for high schools but the rural relations of high schools were studied (Galpin and James, 1918; James and Kolb, 1936). This interest in the small high school was also reflected in Kolb's continuing role, from the mid-1920s on, in study and action activities designed to develop a state policy for high schools -- a policy which would reorganize the high schools for the state (Kolb, 1959:120-130).

That organized interest groups were present and influential was recognized while the community and neighborhood studies were being made. The first systematic study of such groups was reported by Kolb and Wileden in the classic Special Interest Groups in Rural Society (1927). Among the findings with respect to such groups (which excluded those centered in towns or villages or promoted directly by religious and fraternal orders) was that they followed a life cycle of rather definite stages: stimulation, rise, carrying-on and decline. Each stage typically had its own characteristics and problems. The follow-up to the special interest group study examined the factors in the variation between high and low organization rural school districts and in the uneven participation by farm families in the organizations (Kirkpatrick and others, 1929). Today, we might say that this was an attempt to determine structural effects on family and family member social participation. Correlation analysis was used, the first, I believe, of the Wisconsin studies to report the use of this statistical technique.

The farm family was the focus in another line of research, namely the study of farm family living made in cooperation with the departments of Agricultural Economics and Home Economics (along with the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life and Farm Management and Costs of the USDA). The total cost of living and net cash income to the family were not strikingly associated for the years studied, 1929 and 1930 (Farm Family Living in Wisconsin, Kirkpatrick and others, 1933). The same data were used to determine consumption patterns associated with the developmental stages, or life cycle, of farm families (The Life Cycle of the Farm Family, Kirkpatrick and others, 1934). With a different emphasis and in a different context from the standard of living studies, the family was also the focus of depression-period studies for public policy purposes.[17]

Church and religion were not overlooked by Galpin when he mapped the service areas in Walworth County nor by Kolb as a factor in his analysis of Dane County primary groups. The only research publication, Rural Religious Organization: A Study of the Origin and Development of Religious Groups (1924) was, in fact, an off-shoot of the first Dane County study. It dealt in part with the readjustments of abandoned churches, overlapping territory and unchurched territory. Galpin had made six case studies of open-country, hamlet and village churches for an extension-type bulletin, The Country Church: An Economic and Social Force (1917), to show the interrelationship of the rural church and agriculture, of the farmers' church and community life.

Changes and Trends. The early period studies were far from being concerned solely with the structure of rural society. From the first they gave attention to and discussed interaction, process and change. Said Galpin (1915:19), on the basis of his Walworth County work, "the fundamental community is a composite of many expanding and contracting feature communities possessing the characteristic pulsating instability of all real life." Even as Kolb first looked at Dane County's neighborhoods he observed that "changes appear and differing characteristics manifest themselves. These movements and changes seem especially active and transitional just at the present time" (1921:31). Even then he tried to catch the reality by classifying the 121 discovered primary groups under the headings "Not Changed," "Changed Completely," "In Process of Change" and "Recent Appearance;" he discussed and illustrated the group processes of integration, disintegration and realignment observed in these groups. The very notion of the life cycle of country special interest groups carried with it the sense of change, of process.

This interest in process and change led to another set of notable contributions, namely, the studies which systematically

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sought to ascertain changes underway in rural society. Thus, Walworth County was restudied in 1929-30 after an interval of 18 years, showing towns or villages were increasingly becoming the main centers for many of the services required by country families as a net result of the expansions and contractions of service areas, showing increasingly the thread of specialization and interdependency among the different types of centers (Trends in Town-Country Relations, Kolb and Polson, 1933). Dane County neighborhoods were restudied in 1930-31, ten years after the first study, revealing the transfer in emphasis from locality to interest as a major basis for the solidarity of primary groups and showing the increased and more intimate association of farm family members with groups outside the local neighborhood and beyond its own immediate interests (Trends of Country Neighborhoods: A Restudy of Rural Primary Groups, 1921-1931, Kolb, 1933). Understanding of the trends and changes in rural society was also aided by the inclusion of seven Wisconsin communities in the 1930 and 1936 national restudies of the 140 agricultural communities. Finally, in the change studies we must include the study in 1933 of a set of Wisconsin farm families whose living patterns had been surveyed in 1929. This documented the retrenchments in home and community levels of living brought on by four years of national economic emergency (How Farm Families Meet the Emergency, Kirkpatrick and others, 1935). Many farm families were arriving at the point where they needed relief assistance to supplement their living and to maintain public agencies and social facilities. In retrospect, this timely study deepens appreciation of the circumstances which brought the great expansion of government into rural areas.

Social Factors in Farming. Because so many of the early period studies dealt with open-country -- then predominantly farming -- areas, or specifically with farm families, the interrelationships of farm, farm family, school and church, locality, and interest group were a consideration, explicitly or implicitly. Galpin's work was most definitely farm-family centered; "village, town, and other non-farm rural family relations lay beyond the threshold of his observations and investigations" (Kolb, 1948). This concern with the farm family came out clearly in the chapters in Galpins's Rural Life (1918). He was responsible for one piece of research which I have placed under the "Social Factors in Farming" classification. This was a study of the occupancy history, by tenure, over ten years for all farms in the Sun Prairie community (Farm Tenanacy, An Analysis of the Occupancy of 500 Farms, with Hoag, 1919). This study stumbled onto the "retreat" from the farm by retirement. It was an early study of farm tenure, the agricultural ladder, but incorporated as a supplemental study what must have been one of the first investigations of the retired farmer.

Concluding Observations

In summary, I see two central, interrelated "red threads" running through the work in rural sociology at Wisconsin during the early period, starting from its inception under Galpin in 1911. One was the drive to understand and explain rural life and what was happening to it -- the effort to build a science of rural society.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Description was important; but, to build a science, description was underlaid by theory; hypotheses were tested. These efforts were cumulative; each piece of research yielded observations and raised questions which led to further probing into the structure and processes of rural social systems. By the end of the period Wisconsin rural sociologists had enhanced our knowledge of rural society through systematic studies of community, neighborhood, voluntary interest groups, family, and major agencies and institutions including high schools, hospitals, libraries and churches. Although not studied in the same formal and systematic way, it is evident that in the course of these studies the significance of informal groups, of socioeconomic status and of social stratification was recognized. Interrelationships, process and change received as much attention as structure in the study of the organization of rural society. The work in training and the contributions to the development and strengthening of the discipline were means towards the end of a science of rural society.

The second central theme was putting into practice the Wisconsin idea of serving the people of the state, of putting knowledge to use, in this case for the benefit of farm people and others of the rural communty.

Underlying both themes throughout this early period of rural sociology at Wisconsin was what I can best state as a deep sense of commitment to rural life -- a belief in its importance, a desire to improve the well-being of rural people. It was science tempered by humanism.

Notes

1. General sociology was administered within the Department of General Economics until the creation of a separate Department of Sociology and Anthropology effective July 1, 1929 (Kolb, 1931:12). The teaching and graduate training program of the new Department of Rural Sociology was closely integrated with that in General Sociology. This feature, undoubtedly, was one of the strengths of the graduate program in rural sociology at Wisconsin.

2. Throughout this paper I have relied primarily on Arthur F. Wileden's Early History of the Department of Rural Sociology (1979) for details as to names and dates of staff appointments, etc.

3. Descriptions and interpretations of some aspects of the broader setting within which rural sociology started in the United States may be found in Brunner's The Growth of a Science: A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States (1957:1-10) and Nelson's Rural Sociology: Its Origin and Growth in the United States (1969:1-33).

4. The two Columbia dissertations published before 1910 were James M. Williams' An American Town (1906) and Warren H. Wilson's Quaker Hill (1908), the first a study of the Waterville, New York, community and the second a study of a neighborhood area in Dutchess County, New York.

5. All of these were conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Labor and were published between 1898 and 1902. They were "The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia: A Social Study" (1898) and "The Negro in the Black Belt: Some Social Sketches" (1899), both by W.E.B. DuBois; "The Negroes of Sandy Spring, Maryland: A Social Study" (1901a) and "The Negroes of Litwalton, Virginia: A Social Study of the 'Oyster Negro'" (1901b), both by William T. Thom; and "The Negroes of Cinclare Central Factory and Calumet Plantation, Louisiana" (1902) by S. Bradford Laws.

6. The first land-grant colleges known to teach rural sociology were the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts and Cornell University, both in 1904-05. The first course to be offered was Charles R. Henderson's at the University of Chicago, in 1894-95, followed in 1902 by Kenyon L. Butterfield's course at the University of Michigan (Sanderson, 1917:181-208).

7. The Farm Management Association, forerunner of the current professional association of agricultural economists, included the community aspect as one proper part of the subject matter of the agricultural sciences in a statement adopted at its meeting in 1910. The committee on resident instruction of the American

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Association of Land-grant Colleges and Universities, a year later, noted the existence of a group of rural problems quite clearly differentiated from rural economics and vigorously recommended the development of strong courses in rural sociology (Nelson, 1969:30).

8. The seven communities in Wisconsin were Arcadia, Barron, Elkhorn, Fennimore, Medford, Mount Horeb, and Waupaca.

Prior to the forming of the Institute for Social and Religious Research a large number of rural church and community surveys were made or sponsored by a number of religious bodies, among them the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the Church and Country Life Department of the Federal Council of Churches, and the short-lived predecessor of the Institute, the Interchurch World Movement (Nelson, 1969:46-47).

9. A fairly complete listing for the period may be compiled from Kolb's Emerging Rural Communities (1959:187-188), supplemented by Galpin's Wisconsin publications listed in Kolb's paper "Dr. Galpin at Wisconsin" in Rural Sociology 13 (1948):130-145.

10. The books are Galpin's Rural Life (1918); Kolb's co-authored Making the Most of Agriculture (1927, with agricultural economists Theodore Macklin at Wisconsin and W.E. Grimes at Kansas State Agricultural College), Rural Social Trends (1933, with Edmund de S. Brunner); and A Study of Rural Society (with Brunner); and Kirkpatrick's The Farmer's Standard of Living (1929). Also in hardcover was Hill's Rural Relief Trends in Wisconsin from 1934 to 1937 (1939, with Ronald Smith).

11. At the time the new department was getting underway, Kolb (1931:16) considered the chief competitors for graduate training in rural sociology to be Cornell, the University of Minnesota, and Harvard.

12. Wileden (1979) lists 26 persons as receiving their Ph.D. in Rural Sociology from 1923 through 1941.

13. Kolb was a member of the special committee which prepared a "Preliminary Report on Rural Sociological Research in the United States During the Year July 1, 1926-June 30, 1927" (mimeographed) followed by the Social Science Research Monograph, Rural Sociological Research in the United States (1928). He also served on the special advisory committee or was a contributor to a number of the "Scope and Method" bulletins, e.g., Research in Rural Social Work (1932); Research in Rural Organization (1933); Research in Social Psychology of Rural Life (1933). E.L. Kirkpatrick was advisor and contributor for the Scope and Method bulletin on Research in Farm Family Living (1933). Another product of the SSRC overall Advisory Committee's work was the Social Science Research Council monograph Rural Sociological Adult Education in the United States (not dated).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14. The surveys and special studies were the basis for a number of research monographs and special reports by the Rural Section, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, and more than 200 publications issued by the cooperating states (Hobbs, Link, and Winston, 1938).

15. For example, Galpin was a member of the small group which successfully requested that rural sociology be the theme of the American Sociological Society's annual meeting in 1916 (Nelson, 1969:127); the papers presented may be found in The Sociology of Rural Life, Volume XI in the Publications of the American Sociological Society (1917). Kolb not only was member of the advisory committee for the 1924 study by the Institute of Social and Religious Research but was released by the university for one-half year to work on the study. When the same communities were restudied as a part of the work sponsored by President Herbert Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends, Kolb served as co-director, part-time during certain periods and full-time February-September 1932 (Brunner and Kolb, 1933:313).

One immediate consequence of the Purnell Act was the setting up by the Association of Land-grant Colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture of a Committee on Research on Rural Social Organizations and Agencies Essential to a Permanent and Efficient Agriculture. Again, Kolb was centrally involved in some of this committee's activities, activities which included organizing institutes on research methods in rural sociology held in 1927, 1929-30, and in 1932 (the writer has a copy of the numerous mimeographed and typed reports of this joint committee).

16. Galpin visited the folk schools of Denmark in 1914 and on the same trip toured briefly in Norway, and revisited England, Scotland and Wales (Galpin, 1938:64-78). The trip yielded material used in Galpin's teaching. It may also be noted that Kolb and Brunner's A Study of Rural Society, starting with the first edition in 1935, included a bibliography on "Rural Life in Foreign Lands."

17. Depression-period studies for policy purposes included the following in "problem areas" of the state: a survey of families in the Crandon land purchase area (Kirkpatrick, 1936); Man-Land Adjustment: A Study of Family and Inter-Family Aspects of Land Retirement in the Central Wisconsin Land Purchase Area (Hill and others, 1938); and Man in the "Cut-over": A Study of Family-Farm Resources in Northern Wisconsin (Hill and Smith, 1941). Rural households receiving relief were the focus of Rural Relief Trends in Wisconsin (Hill and Smith, 1939).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

References are listed in two sections: Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service publications (below) and other publications cited in this paper (see Reference section II).

I. Publications in Rural Sociology from the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service, 1912-1941 (in chronological order)*

1912
A Method of Making a Social Survey of a Rural Community, Circular 29, C.J. Galpin.

1914
Social Surveys of Rural School Districts, Circular 51, C.J. Galpin and G.W. Davies.

1914
Rural Social Centers in Wisconsin, Bulletin 234, C.J. Galpin.

1915
The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community, Research Bulletin 34, C. J. Galpin.

1916
Rural Clubs in Wisconsin, Bulletin 271, C.J. Galpin and D.W. Sawtelle.

1917
The Church, an Economic and Social Force, Bulletin 278, C.J. Galpin

1918
Rural Relations of High Schools, Bulletin 288, C.J. Galpin and J.A James.

1919
Farm Tenancy: An Analysis of the Occupancy of 500 Farms, Research Bulletin 44, C.J. Galpin and Emily F. Hoag.

1919
The Rural Community Fair, Bulletin 307, C.J. Galpin and Emily F. Hoag.

---

*The listing excludes mimeographed publications such as E.L. Kirkpatrick, What Farm Young People Like and Want (1935) and A.F. Wileden, What Douglas County People Want and What They Are Doing About It (1935); both in a Rural Youth and Rural Life Series. The listing likewise excludes preliminary research reports in mimeographed form. These are generally in the "fugitive literature" category. Not all of the Experiment Station and Extension bulletins were cited in the text.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1919
Play Days in Rural Schools, Circular 118, C.J. Galpin and Eleanor Wiseman.

1920
Social Surveys of Rural School Districts: How Made and How Utilized, Circular 122, C.J. Galpin, G.W. Davies, and Grace Wyman-Stone.

1921
Rural Primary Groups, Research Bulletin 51, J.H. Kolb.

1923
Service Relations of Town and Country, Research Bulletin 58, J.H. Kolb.

1924
Rural Religious Organization, Research Bulletin 60, J.H. Kolb and Charles J. Bornman.

1925
Service Institutions for Town and Country, Research Bulletin 66, J.H. Kolb

1926
Rural Organizations Handbook, Bulletin 384, J.H. Kolb and A.F. Wileden.

1927
Special Interest Groups in Rural Society, Research Bulletin 84, J.H. Kolb and A.F. Wileden.

1928
Making Rural Organizations Effective, Bulletin 403, J.H. Kolb and A.F. Wileden.

1928
Goose Money, Special Circular, Mrs. Carl Felton.

1929
Home Talent Tournaments, Circular 221, J.H. Kolb and D.E. Lindstrom.

1929
Rural Organizations and the Farm Family, Research Bulletin 96, E.L. Kirkpatrick, J.H. Kolb, Creagh Inge, and A.F. Wileden.

1930
Standards of Living: Let's Live While We Work, Circular 241, (co-published by the American Country Life Association for the 1930 Country Life Conference), E.L. Kirkpatrick.

1931
Citizens Survey of Rural Social Conditions in Kenosha County, Special Circular, A.F. Wileden.

1933
Farm Family Living in Wisconsin, Research Bulletin 114, E.L. Kirkpatrick, P.E. McNall, and May L. Cowles.

1933
Trends in Town-Country Relations, Research Bulletin 117, J.H. Kolb and Robert A. Polson.

1933
Trends of Country Neighborhoods, Research Bulletin 120, J.H. Kolb.

1933
Dramatics for Amateur Groups, Circular 257, A.F. Wileden, Ethel T. Rockwell, and Gladys L. Borchers.

1934
The Life Cycle of the Farm Family, Research Bulletin 121, E.L Kirkpatrick, R. Tough, and M.L. Cowles.

1935
How Farm Families Meet the Emergency, Research Bulletin 126, E.L. Kirkpatrick, R. Tough, M.L. Cowles.

1935
How to Conduct Group Discussion, Circular 276, A.F. Wildeden and H.L. Ewbank.

1936
Wisconsin Rural Youth, Bulletin 437, J.A. James and J.H. Kolb.

1938
Man-Land Adjustment, Research Bulletin 134, George W. Hill, Walter L. Slocum, Ruth O. Hill.

1940
Rural Cultural Arts in Wisconsin, Special Circular, John R. Barton.

1941
Man in the "Cut-Over," Research Bulletin 139, George W. Hill and Ronald A. Smith.

1941
Community Surveys by Rural High Schools, Special Bulletin, Zetta E. Bankert.

References, continued

11. References cited other than Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service Publications in Rural Sociology.

Black, John D. (editor) "Scope and Method" series prepared under the direction of The Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture, Social Science Research Council.
1932 Research in Rural Social Work, Bulletin No. 5.

1933 Research in Farm Family Living, Bulletin No. 11.

1933 Research in Rural Organization, Bulletin No. 12.

1933 Research in Social Psychology of Rural Life, Bulletin No. 17.

Brunner, Edmund De S.
1957 The Growth of a Science: A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Brunner, Edmund De S., and J.H. Kolb
1933 Rural Social Trends. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Committee on Rural Social Organization and Agencies Essential to a Permanent and Effective Agriculture (a special committee of the Joint Committee on Projects and Correlation of Research, Association of Land-grant Colleges and U.S. Department of Agriculture).
1927 Report of Institute on Research Methods in Rural Sociology Together with Projects and Recommendations. Mimeo.

DuBois, W. E. B.
1898 "The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia: A Social Study." Pp. 1-38 in U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin 3, No. 14. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1899 "The Negro in the Black Belt: Some Social Sketches." Pp. 401-417 in U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin 4, No. 22. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Eyerly, E.K.
1912 "Cooperative Movements Among Farmers." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 40 (March); 58-68.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Galpin, Charles J.
1911 "The Social Agencies in a Rural Community." Pp. 12-18 in First Wisconsin Country Life Conference, February, 1911. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Serial No. 472, General Series No. 308.

1918 Rural Life. New York: The Century Co.

1938 My Drift into Rural Sociology: Memoirs of Charles Josiah Galpin. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Galpin, Charles J.; J.H. Kolb; E. Dwight Sanderson; and C.C. Taylor.
1927 Preliminary Report of Rural Sociological Research in the United States During the Year July 1, 1926-June 30, 1927. Prepared under the direction of the Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture, Social Science Research Council. Mimeo.

1928 Rural Sociological Research in the United States. A Social Science Research Monograph prepared under the direction of the Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture, Social Science Research Council.

Galpin, Charles J.; C.E. Lively; B.L. Hummel; and C.C. Zimmerman.
1929 Rural Sociological Adult Education in the United States. A Social Science Research Monograph prepared under the direction of the Advisory Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture, Social Science Research Council.

Gillette, John M.
1913 Constructive Rural Sociology. First edition. New York: Sturgis and Walton.

Hill, George W., and Ronald A. Smith
1939 Rural Relief Trends in Wisconsin from 1934 to 1937. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Hobbs, S.H., Jr.; Irene Link; and Ellen Winston under the supervision of T.J. Woofter, Jr.
1938 Plan for Cooperative Rural Research: Organization--Scope--Results. Series II, No. 17. Washington, D.C.: Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration. Mimeo.

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L.
1929 The Farmer's Standard of Living. New York: The Century Co.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1936 Needed Standards of Living for Rural Resettlement. Madison: Wisconsin Rural Rehabilitation Division, Resettlement Administration.

Kolb, John H.

1931 "Brief Story of the Work in Rural Sociology at Wisconsin." Typed manuscript.

1948 "Dr. Galpin at Wisconsin." Rural Sociology 13 (June): 130-145.

1959 Emerging Rural Communities; Group Relations in Rural Society: A Review of Wisconsin Research in Action. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Kolb, John H., and Edmund de S. Brunner

1935 A Study of Rural Society: Its Organization and Changes. (Also revised editions in 1940, 1946, and 1952) Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Laws, J. Bradford

1902 "The Negroes of Cinclare Central Factory and Calumet Plantation, Louisiana." Pp. 95-120 in U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin 7, No. 38. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Macklin, Theodore; W.E. Grimes; and J.H. Kolb

1927 Making the Most of Agriculture: Efficient Marketing--Profitable Farming--Worth-While Living. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Nelson, Lowry

1969 Rural Sociology: Its Origin and Growth in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Russell, H.L.

1911 "Purpose of the Wisconsin Country Life Conference." Pp. 9-12 in First Wisconsin Country Life Conference, Februrary, 1911. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Serial No. 472, General Series No. 308.

Sanderson, Dwight

1917 "The Teaching of Rural Sociology: Particularly in the Land-grant Colleges and Universities." The American Journal of Sociology 22 (January):433-460 (Also in Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. XI, The Sociology of Rural Life, Papers and Proceedings Eleventh Annual Meeting American Sociological Society, pp. 181-208.)

Schultz, Theodore W.

1941 Training and Recruiting of Personnel in the Rural

Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Smith, T. Lynn
1957 "Rural Sociology: A Trend Report and Bibliography." Current Sociology 6:5-18.

Taylor, Carl C.
1948 "Dr. Galpin at Washington." Rural Sociology 13 (June):145-155.

Taylor, Henry C.
1948 "Galpin Undertakes the Study of Rural Life." Rural Sociology 13 (June): 119-129.

Thom, William T.
1901a "The Negroes of Sandy Spring, Maryland: A Social Study." Pp. 43-102 in U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin 6, No. 32. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1901b "The Negroes of Litwalton, Virginia: A Social Study of the 'Oyster Negro.'" Pp. 1115-1170 in U.S. Department of Labor Bulletin 6, No. 37. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress, Senate
1909 Report of the Country Life Commission. Senate Document 705, 60 Congress, 2 session. (Sturgis and Walton published in March 1911, reprinted in 1911 and 1917. Reprinted by The University of North Carolina Press, 1944. Reprinted pp. 1865-1906 in Wayne D. Rasmussen, ed., Agriculture in the United States: A Documentary History, Volume 2,. New York: Random House.)

Wileden, Arthur F.
1979 Early History of the Department of Rural Sociology. Madison: Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

Williams, James M.
1906 An American Town. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilson, Warren H.
1908 Quaker Hill. Privately printed.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF WISCONSIN RURAL SOCIOLOGY - THE MIDDLE PERIOD

by

Edward O. Moe*

There is general consensus that rural sociology had an illustrious beginning at the University of Wisconsin. The works of Charles J. Galpin, John H. Kolb and their associates are landmarks in the beginning and early development of sociological study of rural life and institutions, the building of sociology as a science and the use of sociology and the arts to improve the well-being of rural people.

Dr. Olaf Larson, a participant in this beginning, has identified the contributions of the first period. It is my task to explore the contributions of the middle period or the years from the early 1940s to the middle 1960s. This is a challenging task. It becomes more of a challenge because of a conclusion recently reached by a peer review panel after a careful analysis of the department's teaching, research, public service/extension and international development programs. The department is said to be the premier

---

*Coordinator of Rural Development, Principal Sociologist, Cooperative State Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Retired.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rural Sociology Department in the country.

This middle period is a transitional one. It is a period in which a new generation building on the illustrious but small and sometimes tentative beginning achieved a new level of scientific excellence. How did it happen? What were the critical events? What were the major contributions? How did the department build from its beginnings to first rank among rural sociology departments in the nation?

However much time and conditions have changed, two emphases persist and pervade the work of the department. One is an emphasis on rural people, communities and institutions including agriculture and the changes and transformations taking place. The second is the emphasis on science, in this case, the sociology of rural life and institutions.

Somehow these emphases were linked in what some have called the "Wisconsin idea." However interpreted, science and reason through the creation of new knowledge and its utilization are seen as the way to improve the well-being of people. The State of Wisconsin and the University of Wisconsin with their rich and varied social, cultural and intellectual traditions provided a congenial environment for the growth of a Department of Rural Sociology.

A View of Wisconsin Rural Sociology in the Early Forties

One way of looking at Wisconsin rural sociology at the beginning of the middle period is through the eyes of graduate students who were confronted with the choice of a department and a university and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

who had a number of options including such institutions as Michigan, Cornell, Chicago and Wisconsin. To understand the conditions at the time and the choices made, I talked with a few of the department's distinguished graduates. Why did these people choose the Rural Sociology Department at Wisconsin? And in their view, how did the Department meet their expectations and needs?

They chose Wisconsin for such reasons as:

--to study in the Galpin-Kolb tradition;

--the strength and reputation of graduate education at Wisconsin;

--the strength and reputation of the College of Agriculture and the Department of Agricultural Economics;

--the opportunity to study rural sociology and be related to a department of sociology with men of the stature of E.A. Ross, John L. Gillen, Howard Becker and Ralph Linton;

--the opportunity to do field research in close cooperation with the faculty;

--the opportunity to choose from a number of research opportunities such as community studies, the study of ethnic groups, rural levels of living, man-land adjustments, Wisconsin's changing population; and

--the availability of financial support.

These reasons, then and now, are understandable.

Rural sociology, sociology and the university met their needs and expectations in important ways.

--They were able to form graduate committees including Kolb, Hill, Becker, Gillin, McCormick, Linton, McNeil, Wehrwein.

--High educational standards were set and maintained with fairness and equity.

--Strong positive, supportive relationships were established with the faculty including the opportunity to do field work with faculty.

--Faculty in Rural Sociology and Agricultural Economics were widely known over the state, and able to provide access and open doors.

The emphasis on building a science and on rural well-being were continually in a state of lesser or greater tension. This tension heightened and enriched the challenge of graduate work. People left Wisconsin feeling they had received an excellent graduate education, and they were ready to take on the changing world around them.

Conditions and Events in the Middle Period: The Social and Intellectual Context

The staff of the Department of Rural Sociology in the 1940s included four or five sociologists and an impressive group in public affairs and the arts -- music, drama, arts and crafts and artists in residence. John H. Kolb was chairman and remained so until 1949. While the department was small, it had substantial strengths in its own right. These strengths were enhanced by the Department of Sociology, the graduate school, the College of Agriculture and the total University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The social and intellectual climate was permeated by the heritage of the Depression and World War II and the monumental task of reconstruction of war-torn nations and the development of the underdeveloped parts of the world. There was heightened concern about social, cultural and institutional change and the process of development. It was a time of increasing affluence. University programs were expanding. Student enrollments at both undergraduate and graduate levels were increasing. Rapid developments were being made in science, social science and sociology. Major international development programs were initiated by the United States and other nations, programs far beyond the scale of anything done previously. These programs created new opportunities and made new demands on universities.

Despite the tragedy of war, faith in science and technology, a kind of innocence and a pervading sense of confidence characterized the social and intellectual climate of the time.

Within the decade of the 1940s, significant changes were initiated in the department and its programs. These changes in one sense were a logical and necessary development out of the Galpin-Kolb tradition and the work of Kolb, Wileden, Kirkpatrick, Hill and others in the 1930s and 1940s. In another sense, they were a severe challenge to the tradition and a strong assertion of the needs and demands of an emerging science of sociology and rural sociology.

Some Critical Events in the Development of the Department. With the strong foundation that had been laid and the emerging

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

opportunities at Wisconsin, staff additions became critical events in the building of the Department. Time and space permit only a brief discussion of some major and pervasive influences in the period from the forties to the middle sixties. My view of these major events takes this form:

1. An event of major proportions, and perhaps the most significant one in this middle period, was the selection of William H. Sewell as a member of the faculty in 1946 and his selection and service as chairman from 1949-1955.

   His major contribution was in strengthening sociology/rural sociology as a science and thereby increasing its capacity to deal with problems and policy. He helped the department clarify its functions and gain a new sense of identity.

2. A second staff addition of profound significance was the addition of Eugene A. Wilkening in 1952 and his service as chairman from 1956-59. Dr. Wilkening personified the science-building, policy-making and problem-solving capacities of rural sociology.

3. A third influence was the service of Douglas Marshall as staff member and chairman. His skill in supporting staff members, in helping secure resources, in contributions to the rural development efforts of the College of Agriculture and in establishing the Applied Population Laboratory have helped shape the department.

4. A fourth factor is the distinguished contributions of Glenn V. Fuguitt, Archibald O. Haller, A. Eugene Havens and Donald E. Johnson who are still in the department, and W. Keith Warner, Gordon Bultena and William L. Flinn who have left. Their contributions helped bring the department to firstrank among departments of rural sociology. Others like Murray A. Straus made important contributions but were with the department for two years or less.

Fuguitt, Haller and Johnson served as chairman of the department.

The Concern with the Practical and the Aversion to Theory. William H. Sewell and the Department of Rural Sociology at Wisconsin made major contributions in sociology-rural sociology as a science. Discussion and debate over the concern with the practical and the aversion to theory were continuous through the middle period. Sewell, before a joint session of the American and Rural Sociological Societies, December 29, 1949, reviewed the work of a Rural Sociological Society Committee on "Needed Research." Sewell expressed his continuing concern:

> ...I wish to call attention to the fact that there are dangers in the exclusively practical emphasis which I believe have in the past, and may well in the future, limit the development of our science. (1950, p. 121)

Outcomes of the practical emphasis of the time, as he saw it, led to a preoccupation only with the immediately practical and forced us into situations in which research which would test existing or build new knowledge was not possible. This resulted in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the added danger that other people would define the field, and indicate the kinds of research and other activities in which the rural sociologist would be engaged.

He concluded his paper by saying that if rural sociologists possessed the theoretical training to recognize strategical hypotheses to be formulated, the knowledge of methodology to test these hypotheses and the maturity to suggest modifications and extensions of knowledge indicated by empirical inquiry, it mattered little whether our research grew out of practical or pure research interests.

Such ideas reverberated through departmental discussions in the middle period. They came to dominate the research, teaching, extension/public service and international development programs.

In one of the best articles ever written on rural sociological research, Sewell (1965) noted that rural sociological research had come a long way in thirty years, that it had been sensitive to needs of rural people and rural society, that its contributions in the United States and abroad had been significant and that it was making a solid but varied contribution to the science of sociology. There was still room, however, for considerable improvement in the practical theoretical and methodological aspects of the discipline.

Wisconsin Rural Sociology: Major Contributions of the Middle Period

With this characterization of the department and some of the influences which shaped it, we can now turn to its specific contributions. I will list its contributions as I see them and then briefly discuss each contribution. The major contributions:

1. During this period the flow of significant research contributions increased, strengthening the science of sociology-rural sociology, strengthening the contribution to the resolution of rural problems and providing a better basis for formulation of rural policy.
2. The education and training at the master's and doctorate levels produced a continuing flow of outstanding sociologists-rural sociologists. Some 55 doctorates were awarded in this middle period.
3. Some exemplary work took place in extension/public service, particularly dealing with rural organizations and in community and rural development.
4. The Applied Population Laboratory was created as a new mechanism to disseminate population and demographic data to various users and to show users how to interpret and use such data.
5. Outstanding work occurred in international development. Competence increased in other nations to use sociology-rural sociology to strengthen social science and to work on social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

problems.

6. An illustrious record of service was given to the profession of sociology-rural sociology and to the wider scientific community in the United States and throughout the world.

One can list only a few of the major contributions in each area.

Research. One important area of research which had depth, elaboration, continuity and significant spinoffs was the work on social status and the personality adjustment of the child, and the related work of status attainment and social mobility. Initiated by Sewell, and followed up through the collaboration of Sewell, Haller, Straus, Portes and others, it was published in prestigious journals and books and influenced a generation of researchers in the United States and abroad. The methodology, the new measures and scales and analytical procedures were widely used by others.

It spawned a large number of studies on the vocational, educational, residential, and family aspirations and expectations of rural youth. It helped clarify the career selection process. Over 400 entries from this body of research found their way into current research information systems in education.

A second major area was the work in population and demography initiated by Kolb and Hill in the pre-1940 period and carried on by Marshall and Fuguitt in the middle period. Important work was done on Wisconsin's population, the city and the countryside, the small town in America, trends in unincorporated places, and small town growth in the United States. Such work supported the Applied Population Laboratory. It became linked with work done in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

general department and the Center for Demography and Ecology. Work in this period helped lay the foundation for the excellent work done after 1970 on population redistribution and the turn-around in urban-rural migration. Important contributions were made in a substantive sense, in methodology and ways of estimating populations, and in the uses of such data for planning purposes.

A third major research contribution was in the sociology of agriculture. Here Wilkening, Fuguitt, Havens and others did continuing work on the acceptance of farm practices, family factors affecting acceptance of practices, the diffusion process, the study of innovativeness and innovations, an evaluation of farm and home development over the years 1954-59, part-time farming and the role definitions of county extension agents. Important work was done on the diffusion of technical knowledge as an instrument in economic development. Toward the end of the period Wilkening, Havens, Flinn and others were dealing with aspects of these problems in Colombia and Brazil.

This work was widely used in Wisconsin and elsewhere. It tended to set patterns and standards which were generally followed.

A fourth major area initiated in this period and still continuing is the sociology of development. Havens, Haller, Wilkening, Flinn, Johnson and others looked at development on a cross-cultural basis. Work on innovations and innovativeness was done in Colombia and Brazil. The uses of socio-economic research in developing strategies of change and development were examined. Methodological issues in the study of development were identified and clarified. Structural determinants of action and inaction were looked at in various settings. This work drew from and contributed to the department's and the University's international programs, which became exemplary. This work as well as that done on the sociology of agriculture provide a more solid basis for some of the current studies of the structure of agriculture in the United States and elsewhere.

There are other contributions but these are the more significant in this middle period.

The Education-Training of Productive People. Over the years Wisconsin has distinguished itself in the selection and education of sociologists-rural sociologists. Those trained in this middle period were knowledgeable about theory, sophisticated about methodology and able to assess and make additions to existing knowledge. This is true both of those from the United States as well as those from other countries.

Some Exemplary Work in Extension Public Service. From the 1920s on Kolb, Wileden and others provided substantive sociological data, helped strengthen the educational processes in extension and were effective extension practitioners. Marshall, Johnson, Wilkening and others continued aspects of this work. Marshall helped initiate and carry through studies including those in Price and Kenosha Counties, which provided a more solid basis for developing strategies in rural development. The evaluation of the farm and home program and the analysis of the roles of county agents helped make extension more effective as an institution. Johnson's

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

work strengthened rural development-community development in the state.

The Creation of New Mechanisms: The Applied Population Laboratory. The research on population and demography was facilitated by the creation in 1959 of the Laboratory of Applied Population and Community Analysis. Marshall was its first director, and early staff members included Glenn Fuguitt and Hazel Reinhardt. Over the years the laboratory has helped strengthen research in demography, has facilitated flow of population and demographic data to local governments, state agencies and other users in the state, and has enabled the department and the university to upgrade methods of population estimates. It has enabled the department to help people understand and use demographic data with increasing effectiveness. By doing this, it has enhanced the university's relevance to its constituents and local government users.

Outstanding Work in International Development. The departments' and the univerity's work in this field is distinctive. Five major contributions have been made. First of all is the training in the Wisconsin pattern of nationals from other countries, particularly those from Latin America. Sociologists-rural sociologists of the stature of Alejandro Portes and Jose Pastore are examples. A second contribution is the assistance in creating institutions and positions within institutions in which trained people could be effective whether they worked in teaching, research, extension or administration. A third contribution is work including field research within the various countries on a collegial basis

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which helped define workable, acceptable, effective role models for nationals to use and adapt to the local scene. A fourth contribution was the creation of networks for nationals and an appreciation of the necessity for social scientists to establish their own support systems to keep them effective over time. A fifth contribution was strengthening cross-cultural work in sociology-rural sociology which has always been a promising but underdeveloped dimension of social science.

An Illustrious Record of Service to the Profession and to the Wider Scientific Community. The record of service to sociology and to science is outstanding. Sewell, Wilkening, Haller and Fuguitt have served as presidents of the Rural Sociological Society. Sewell, after leaving the department, was the president of the American Sociological Association. Fuguitt and other members of the staff helped create the International Rural Sociology Association and Fuguitt served as first president. Members of the staff continually served on national advisory and policy bodies. This record of service attests to the excellence of their work, their qualities of leadership and the respect and esteem in which they are held by their peers.

A Concluding Word

Rural sociology at Wisconsin reached new highs in the middle period. It increased its strength in a scientific sense, and enhanced its capacity to help solve socio-economic problems in agriculture and rural society. The department was strong in its own right, and its strengths were increased by its relationships to the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Department of Sociology. Rural sociology helps relate Wisconsin sociology to the state, its people, its rural areas and its problems. This encourages excellence in applied research and in the application and utilization of knowledge. The Department of Sociology helps link rural sociology to the main currents in the field, and helps create and maintain a climate for academic and scientific excellence.

There are strong, reciprocal relationships between the College of Agriculture and the department. The college helps provide a broader view of rural life and agriculture in the state, and provides a useful context for collaboration with other disciplines in building science and using science to solve problems. Rural sociology provides a unique and needed perspective on the human and institutional problems in agriculture and rural areas.

The university is the context in which these relationships are defined and redefined over time to serve both science and the people. Tension in these relationships will always be present. Developments in the middle period which helped build rural sociology as a science seem at this point in time to have served both science and the people.

References

Brooks, Harvey
1974 "Are Scientists Obsolete?" Science 186: 501-508.

Coleman, James S.
1973 "The Principles Governing Policy Research." APA Monitor (February): 6.

1973 "Ten Principles Governing Policy Research." Footnotes ASA Vol. 1 (No. 3).

Demerath III, N.J., Otto Larson and Karl F. Schuessler (editors)
1975 Social Policy and Sociology. New York: Academic Press.

de Solla Price, Derik J.
1970 "Citation Measures of Hard Science, Soft Science and Non-science." In Carnot E. Nelson and Donald K. Pollock(eds.), Communication Among Scientists and Engineers.Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books.

Etzioni, Amitai
1971 "Policy Research." The American Sociologist 6 (June): 8-12.

Hightower, James
1972 Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Larson, Olaf F.
1965 "Income and Welfare of Rural People - Agricultural Research Significant to Public Policy, Public Welfare and Community Improvement." Rural Sociology 30 (December) 452-461.

Likert, Rensis
1940 "Democracy in Agriculture - Why and How." Farmers in a Changing World. Yearbook of Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office: 994-1002.

Loomis, Charles P. and Zona Kemp Loomis
1967 "Rural Sociology." Pp. 655-691 in P. Lazarsfeld, W. Sewell and H. Wilensky (eds.), The Uses of Sociology. New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, Andre and Jean Mayer
1974 "Agriculture: The Island Empire." Daedalus 103 (Summer): 83-97.

McCalla, Alex
1978 "The Politics of the U.S. Agricultural Research Establishment." Policy Studies Journal 6 (Summer): 479-83.

Merton, Robert
1975 "Social Knowledge and Public Policy: Sociology Perspectives on Four Presidential Commissions." Pp. 153-78 in Mirra Komarovsky (ed), Sociology and Public Policy. New York: Elsevier.

Myrdal, Gunnar
1953 "The Relation Between Social Theory and Social Policy."
British Journal of Sociology 3 (September): 210-12.

Nelson, Lowry
1965 "The Rise of Rural Sociology: The Pre-Purnell Period." Rural Sociology 30 (December):407-27.

Nolan, Michael F. and John F. Galliher
1973 "Rural Sociological Research and Social Policy: Hard Data, Hard Times." Rural Sociology 38 (Winter): 491-99.

Nolan, Michael F. and Robert A. Hagan
1975 "Rural Sociological Research, 1966-74: Implications for Social Policy." Rural Sociology 40 (4) (Winter): 435-54.

Olson, Philip
1979 "Public Policy and the Politics of Agriculture: Organization Inaction." Rural Sociology 44 (2) (Summer): 266-80.

Perkins, James A.
1966 The University in Transition. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Schorr, Alvin L.
1968 Explorations in Social Policy. New York: Basic Books.

Sewell, William H.
1950 "Needed Research in Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 15 (June): 115-25.

1965 "Rural Sociology Research, 1936-1965." Rural Sociology 30 (December): 428-51.

Shills, Edward
1975 "Social Science as Centrality." Society 12 (July-August): 6-9.

Stokes, C. Shannon and Michael K. Miller
1975 "A Methodological Review of Research in Rural Sociology Since 1965." Rural Sociology 40 (Winter): 411-34.

Street, David P., and Eugene A. Weinstein
1975 "Problems and Prospects of Applied Sociology." The American Sociologist 10 (May): 65-72.

Swanson, Guy E.
1971 "Review Symposium on the Coming Crisis in Western Sociology." The American Sociological Review 36 (April).

Taves, Marvin J., and Neal Gross
1952 "A Critique of Rural Sociology Research, 1950." Rural Sociology 17 (June): 109-18.

Taylor, Carl C.
1940 "The Contribution of Sociology to Agriculture." Farmers in a Changing World. Yearbook of Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office: 1043-55.

Wade, Nicholas
1973 "Agriculture: Social Sciences Oppressed and Poverty Stricken." Science 180: 719-22.

Warner, W. Keith
1974 "Rural Society in a Post-industrial Age." Rural Sociology 39 (Fall): 306-18.

Williams, Robin M. Jr.
1946 "Review of Current Research in Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 11 (June): 103-14.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY:

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE 1970S

by

Daryl J. Hobbs*

The preceding papers of Moe and Larson have defined for me the most recent era of the UW Rural Sociology Department. They left me the period from the late 1960s to the present -- a period during which I feel the department has undergone a notable transition. Perhaps that transition can be partially characterized by noting that Moe and Larson concentrated largely on a few personalities central to the emergence, development and survival of rural sociology at the University of Wisconsin. I find it difficult to follow their lead. Were I to concentrate on personalities I would feel it necessary to include all present faculty and several who were on the faculty during the 1970s. I find the most recent era of the department to be impressive more for the collective accomplishments of the entire faculty than for the exceptional achievements of a few.

I had the privilege of being a visiting professor in the Department of Rural Scoiology at Wisconsin during the spring of 1968. In my judgment this was in the midst of the transition for

---

*Professor of Rural Sociology, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the department -- a transition much more clearly recognizable from the distance of the spring of 1981 than from the proximity of 1968. While I recall a faculty recognition of change at that time and the need for change, I am equally confident in recalling that there was a great deal of uncertainty about the direction and implications of those changes for the department, for rural sociology and for universities generally.

The spring of 1968 was a season of significant political unrest. It was spring of sensational and often shocking events: the assassinations of Martin Luther King and of Robert Kennedy, the announcement by President Johnson that he would not seek re-election, the flourishing of the anti-war movement, capped off by the Chicago police riot at the Democratic National Convention, etc. Perhaps Wisconsin as a state and a university was as much preoccupied with these events as any place. It was difficult for business to proceed as usual. When conversations in the department and on campus shifted away from external political events and back to departmental and discipline-related issues there was great concern for the relevance of the social sciences. The inner cities were the focus of much political unrest which, combined with the burgeoning urban population, focused public, political and academic interest there. If sociologists were relevant they were focusing their attention on the cities and the national social, economic and political contradictions. It was not that there were not equally important issues to be found in rural America. But rural had a low profile. It was populated by the "People Left Behind." Rural people with resources or mobility were perceived to have departed for the cities. Numerous essays were devoted to the death of small towns -- a conjecture which proved to be premature and exaggerated, as documented by Glenn Fuguitt and associates in the early 1970s.

This was a period of rapid growth for sociology. Growth was occurring in student numbers, in stipends and fellowships for graduate students, and departmental budgets, nor were research grants difficult to obtain. This was also the period during which a distinction was often made between "rural" sociology and "real" sociology -- not always in jest. It was a period during which many land grant sociology programs, if not departments, lost much of their identity in favor of mergers with general sociology programs. Wisconsin was one of the exceptions, although during this period a closer working relationship with general sociology at Wisconsin was fashioned -- one that persists today.

I don't recall any serious discussion of the demise of rural sociology at Wisconsin at that time. On the contrary, students and faculty both were increasing. But I do recall some concern with identity. Students seemed to be attracted to rural sociology more for its applied reputation and its international and development emphasis than for any overriding interest in domestic rural problems. The extent of growth in graduate students was dramatic, although not matched by a corresponding increase in faculty. According to Art Wileden's history of the department (1979), the department produced 73 Ph.Ds between 1966 and 1976, exactly the same number produced in the 43 years from 1923 through 1965. Despite the large increase in graduate students the faculty grew from nine in 1960 to only 12 in 1970, and its size has since remained relatively constant.

The transition was marked not only by growth in student numbers but also by a major commitment to international research, training and social and economic development, especially in Latin America. Of the 73 students receiving Ph.D.s during the period 1966-76, about 40 percent were non-U.S. citizens with more than half of those being from Latin America. In contrast, fewer than 10 percent of the Ph.D.s awarded in the preceding 43 years were non-U.S. citizens. Although the extent of the international commitment is partially reflected in the number of students trained, that alone is an insufficient indicator. Nearly half the faculty of the 1970s spent extended periods of time in Latin America cooperating in local research, administering development projects, directing student research and developing institutional linkages in southern Brazil and throughout the Andean region. The international involvement has been focused, with a foundation established for continuing reciprocal relationships. For the Rural Sociology Department it is clear that international work has been accorded an emphasis at least as great as the traditional land grant triumvirate of domestic teaching, research and extension. It has been my continuing observation that the international emphasis within the department has gone well beyond the granting of degrees and the publication of research articles. It has involved the development of continuing interpersonal and interinstitutional relationships that have been, and will likely continue to be, mutually beneficial. At a minimum the continuing international involvement has made it easier for the department to avoid excessive provincialism.

In contrast to the earlier eras discussed by Moe and Larson, the transition of the 1960s and 1970s seems to have occurred as a collective effort rather than as the result of the influence of any dominant individual such as a Kolb or a Sewell. The recent faculty of the department has been one of diverse styles and perspectives, with members seeming to share little more than a common commitment to high standards, productivity and effectiveness in their respective areas of interest. It would seem to be a collective commitment to excellence, while retaining a tolerance for diversity, that has brought the department to where it is today. What has emerged out of this transition is a demonstrably strong academic department competing with the best of sociology departments in scholarly publications, while simultaneously maintaining a commitment to improving social and economic well-being both domestically and internationally. That is a judgment reached only after careful review and evaluation of the history and performance of the department over the past 10-15 years. What I found in this review was so generally impressive that it would seem unfortunate if it were not included in the record of this occasion. Consequently the following pages will be largely devoted to reporting the recent accomplishments of the department and comparing that record with the sociology and rural sociology departments in the country. The final part of the paper will be devoted to some thoughts about whether the transition is complete, or whether it is still in process.

Faculty Publication

The most visible effort of an academic department is the published writing of its faculty. It is this measure of output more than any other that accounts for the relative prestige of an academic department (Blau, 1973). During the 1960s and 1970s there have been numerous published articles addressed to faculty productivity and prestige ranking of sociology departments. One recent article by Grimes, Pinhey and Phifer (1978) dealt specifically with departments of rural sociology.

Faculty publications produce their own set of self-fulfilling prophecies. More publications in more prestigious sources tend to attract outstanding students, who in turn contribute to more research, to greater success in attracting research support, to faculty appointments to prestigious committees, policy-making bodies, etc.

The current Rural Sociology faculty has compiled an envious record of publication over the past five years. The ten faculty members, from 1975-1979, produced nine books and monographs (three of which were published in Spanish), 31 chapters in books, 76 journal articles, and 45 bulletins and published reports. Of these 161 publications, 139 were produced by the nine faculty members who were on the staff throughout most of the 1975-1979 period. There are several aspects of this publication record deserving of further comment.

One particularly impressive feature of the record is the extent to which the full-time faculty shared in publication. The two faculty members who are on 75 percent or more extension appointment both published two journal articles during that period. One faculty member, on only a 20 percent research appointment, published five journal articles. The remaining seven faculty members, all of whom are on at least 50 percent research, each published a minimum of six journal articles during the five year period. When books, journal articles and extension and other publshed reports are added together, the output per faculty member ranged from a low of eight published items to a high of 21, with a mean of 15. There are some rural sociology departments whose most productive members will match those at Wisconsin, but I know of none where productivity is so uniformly high across the entire faculty.

Since evaluation of faculty has become a matter of increasing concern, much recent attention across academia has been devoted to the relative prestige of the journals in which publication occurs. Impressed as I was with the publication of 76 journal articles, I solicited the help of Jim McCartney, who is editor of the _American Sociologist_ and who has an active interest in the sociology of science, to assign a prestige rating to the published articles. Our assessment was that 40 of the 76 articles were in what have been called the top 22 sociology journals, or their equivalent. Specifically, 22 of the 76 articles were in _Rural Sociology_, _American Journal of Sociology_, _The American Sociological Review_, _Social Forces_, _Sociological Quarterly_, and _Demography_ (Table 1).

Table 1. Journals in Which UW Rural Sociology Faculty Published Articles 1975-1979

Journals:	No.
Rural Sociology	10
American Journal of Sociology	4
Demography	4
Luso-Brazilian Review	3
Social Indicators Research	3
American Sociological Review	2
Small Town	2
Social Forces	2
Sociological Quarterly	2
Wisconsin Natural Resources	2
American Journal of Agricultural Economics	1
Canadian Journal of Sociology	1
Contemporary Sociology	1
Demografia y Economia	1
Desarollo Rural en las Americas	1
Economia Trentina	1
Economic Development and Cultural Change	1
Energy Systems and Policy	1
Environmental Comment	1
Environmental Impact Assessment	1
Growth and Change	1
Humboldt Journal of Social Sciences	1
Industrial Relations	1
Journal of American Statistical Association	1
Journal of Community Development	1
Journal of Environmental Education	1
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	1
Journal of Social Issues	1
Journal of Vocational Behavior	1
Kontakt	1
Land Economics	1
Medical Care	1
Monthly Review	1
Newsline	1
Planning	1
Psychiatric Spectator	1
Review of Religious Research	1
Revista Mexicana de Sociologia	1
Rocaniki Socjoloch Wsi	1
Social Science Quarterly	1
Social Science Research	1
Sociologia Ruralis	1
Sociologia Urbana Rurale	1
Sociology and Social Research	1
Sociology of Education	1
Sociological Methods and Research	1
Sociological Microjournal	1
The Annual Review of Sociology	1
The Natural Resources Journal	1
Transaction/Society	1

Others included such journals as the American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Economic Development and Cultural Change, Journal of the American Statistical Association, Sociology of Education, etc.

I call attention to the above journals not necessarily because publication in them outweighs publication in others, but because they have been used in previous studies to evaluate productivity of Ph.D. sociologists. For example Clemente, in a 1972 study, evaluated professional publication in the top 22 sociology journals of 2,205 sociologists who received their Ph.D.s between 1950 and 1966. Clemente found that 36 percent had published no articles during the 19 year period under evaluation. The remainder had produced an average of 2.5 articles and 0.8 books during the 18 years. In a 1970 study Glenn and Villemez evaluated publication in the top 22 sociology journals among 1,060 sociologists in the top 45 rated departments of sociology. The period of evaluation was between 1965 and 1968. They found per person productivity to be .34 articles per year, or one article every three years. In no department was per person productivity as high as one article per year (highest was Harvard at 0.74). Only eight departments had an average productivity in excess of one article every two years.

In a somewhat more comprehensive study Lightfield analyzed the productivity of 200 sociologists who had received their degrees between 1954 and 1958. The period of evaluation was from 1953-1968. The study included production of articles, chapters and books. It was found that one item every 2.5 years represented average productivity.

Although times change, it is of some interest to compare the productivity of the UW Rural Sociology faculty for the period 1975-1979 with data from the above studies. If we use the standard of the top 22 sociology journals or their equivalent used in two of the above studies, then the rate of productivity for UW Rural Sociology faculty is 0.88 per year; a rate higher than any department reported in the Glenn and Villemez study. No UW rural sociologist, even those on extension appointments, rated as low as the average reported by either Clemente or Lightfield. If all publications (except reports and extension publications) produced by the UW rural sociologists are combined for the 5 year period, the mean is 2.2 published items per faculty member per year -- a rate unsurpassed in any of the studies reviewed.

Another measure of recent publication accomplishment of the department is reported in a Rural Sociology article by Grimes, Pinhey and Phifer (1978). They analyzed the relative productivity of various departments in terms of publication in Rural Sociology. Their analysis covered ten year periods beginning with initial publication of Rural Sociology as a journal in 1936. Except for Wisconsin they found a relative lack of stability in the ratings for departments (rated according to number of articles in Rural Sociology authored by persons affiliated with each school). Wisconsin was the fourth ranked school in the period of 1936-45, moved to first between 1946-55, dropped back to second between 1956-65 and then moved far in front of the other departments for the period 1966-75. During the 1966-75 period UW-affiliated authors had 40 articles in Rural Sociology, followed by Penn State in second place with 18.

My more recent analysis of Rural Sociology articles between 1976 and 1980 reveals that approximately 19 percent of the articles were authored or coauthored by a Wisconsin faculty member or a person who had recently received their degree from Wisconsin.

While the above provide a basis for comparison against other studies there are other features of the UW publication record deserving of comment and indicative of the breadth of influence of the faculty. Of the 76 published journal articles, 13 were published in other than American journals. Seven of these were published in a language other than English. The articles were published in 51 different journals, 26 of which are journals of disciplines other than sociology or journals with a public policy or development orientation. The list of journals itself is informative about UW Rural Sociology. It suggests that the department has not only carried its weight in scholarly sociological publication, but has also extended its research influence internationally and into a large number of problem areas.

Collaboration in research and publication seems to be the norm in the department. Seven of the nine books published between 1975 and 1979 were co-authored; 15 of the 31 chapters published during that time were co-authored; 59 of the 76 articles were co-authored. What is of particular interest however is to note with whom the articles were co-authored. Almost without exception the co-authors were from other departments or institutions, or former graduate students. None of the seven co-authored books were authored with another faculty member of the department, only two of the 15 co-authored chapters were with another UW Rural Sociology faculty member, and only three of the 59 co-authored journal articles involved authorship with another departmental faculty member. This provides another indication of the pervasive professional interrelationships of departmental faculty, and the encouragement to graduate students to publish.

Master's and Ph.D. Theses

Between 1974 and 1979 the UW Rural Sociology faculty directed 39 doctoral dissertations and 37 masters theses. Not all of these students received their degree in Rural Sociology because of the joint graduate program with the general Sociology department.

Of the 39 doctoral recipients 23 were U.S. citizens and 16 were from other countries. Of the dissertation topics 23 were completed on problems pertaining to the U.S. while five each pertained to Colombia and Brazil, two pertained to Zambia and one each was addressed to problems in the Philippines, Spain, Nigeria and Peru (Table 2).

Master's degree recipients showed a similar division between domestic and international students and topics. Twenty-six of the Master's degrees were completed by U.S. citizens, and 11 by international students. Twenty-five were addressed to problems of the U.S., four each to Chile and Colombia, two to Brazil and one each to Ecuador and Bolivia.

Table 2. Dissertations and Masters Theses Completed by UW Rural Sociology Students - 1974-1979

Of 39 doctoral dissertations completed:
23 were by U.S. citizens
16 by non-U.S.citizens

23 were completed on problems pertaining to the U.S.
5 pertained to Colombia
5 pertained to Brazil
2 pertained to Zambia
1 pertained to the Philippines
1 pertained to Spain
1 pertained to Nigeria
1 pertained to Peru

21 of the 39 pertained to issues of power, inequality and distribution of income and opportunity

Of 37 master degree theses completed:
26 were by U.S. citizens
11 by non-U.S. citizens

25 were completed on problems pertaining to the U.S.
4 pertained to Chile
4 pertained to Colombia
2 pertained to Brazil
1 pertained to Ecuador
1 pertained to Bolivia

20 of the 37 pertained to issues of power, inequality and distribution of income and opportunity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Among current members of the Rural Sociological Society, Wisconsin just barely leads Cornell as the source of the Ph.D. degree. There were 71 current members of the Society who list Wisconsin as the university granting their Ph.D. while 65 list Cornell. Following Wisconsin and Cornell there is a significant drop to Iowa State with 34 and Penn State with 32. Closely grouped behind them are Michigan State with 24, Ohio State with 21, Missouri with 18, LSU with 17 and Kentucky with 16.

Of the 71 Wisconsin Ph.D. members of the Rural Sociological Society, four received the degree during the 1930s, five during the 1940s, 15 during the 1950s, 19 during the 1960s and 28 during the 1970s.

There are 34 current members of the Rural Sociological Society who received their Ph.D. from Wisconsin between 1969 and 1980. Of these, 21 are currently on the faculty of 14 different land grant universities, one is with USDA, two are on the faculty of provincial universities in Canada, three are outside of North America and seven are on the faculty of various non-land grant colleges and universities in the U.S.

There is an interesting aspect of the graduate student output of the department. It reflects the existence of multiple "rural sociologies" which may gain greater signifcance in the future. It is also reflective of the emphases in the department. Of the 39 persons completing doctoral dissertations during the period 1974 through 1979, only 11 are to be found among current members of the Rural Sociological Society. This is suggestive to me of three major categories of rural sociologists. The first and most numerous category includes those foreign national students who are returning to their home countries and filling a variety of administrative and academic roles. It is understandable that relatively few of these become members of the Rural Sociological Society. This category includes 16 of the 39 recent dissertations. The second category we might label as the Rural Sociology regulars -- those that Busch and Lacey (1979) identify as the dominant category among rural sociologists. These people usually end up on the faculties of land grant universities which have rural sociology programs, and become active in the Rural Sociological Society. This category includes 11 of the 39.

While it is difficult to typify the remaining 12 it is likely that they are people who have an interest in rural social issues, but for some reason do not seek or find employment in land grant universities, and /or choose not to identify with the Rural Sociological Society. As interest in rural-based problems and issues increases both domestically and internationally without a concomitant increase in rural sociology positions and programs, this latter category may well increase disproportionately in the future.

Research Emphases

Although the numbers are impressive and the department could hold its own in accomplishments with any rural or general department in the country, a more pertinent question concerns the issues to which the effort is addressed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rural sociology has been criticized in many recent articles for its tendency to stick to relatively safe and relatively innocuous issues (Busch and Lacey, 1979; Friedland, 1979; Newby and Buttel, 1980). In the parlance of many recent analysts, we are called "technicians," more addressed to the smaller technical problems of management and control than the larger, more controversial issues of who controls, toward what purpose, and for whose benefit? It has also been observed that there is relative safety in producing fragments of narrow, specialized data and research which cause little trouble unless someone bothers to put together the pieces.

Consequently, in taking a look at the recent contributions of the department, I felt it important to determine the kinds of issues toward which the research and writing was addressed. I adopted for heuristic purposes a very broad and vague category for classification: work that was concerned with power, inequality, and distribution of income and opportunity. It is obviously dangerous to classify work on the basis of titles, but nevertheless I proceeded first through all the books, chapters and articles published by the faculty, then on to the Masters theses and Doctoral dissertations. Having grown more brave I proceeded to the index of Rural Sociology for the period 1976 through 1980.

I realize that the issue to which my attention was directed was pursued in the department employing a variety of methodologies and theoretical paradigms, but nevertheless I found that of doctoral dissertations completed in the department between 1974 and 1979 about 55 percent could be loosely classified as being concerned with power, inequality and structural impediments. Of the masters theses I so classified 54 percent. Of the faculty books, chapters and journal articles I classified 44 percent as being concerned with those issues.

It was interesting to me that the proportion of articles in Rural Sociology fitting my heuristic category has been increasing since 1976. I classified 24 percent of the Rural Sociology articles in 1976, 19 percent in 1977, 29 percent in 1978, 42 percent in 1979 and 36 percent in 1980 as pertaining broadly to power and inequality.

If, as several have charged, rural sociologists have generally been timid and tentative in the problems they choose for research and the way they research them, then at least it can be said that the work of the UW Rural Sociology Department has been less timid.

Extension

As with other activities of the department, fulfilling extension responsibilities has been done with focus and quality. Of the total professional effort of the department just about one-third is devoted to extension work. Of the ten professors, four are on partial extension appointments, including two -- Slesinger and Johnson -- who have a major extension commitment. However, the "extension" work of the department is not confined to those who are officially on an extension appointment. Other faculty are variously involved in public affairs publication and education, such as the work of Tom Heberlein with various groups and organizations on outdoor recreation, and the work of Gene Summers with various in-state groups on rural industrialization. Seven different faculty

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

members authored extension and research bulletins during the past five years.

Commanding a major part of the organized extension effort is the operation of the Applied Population Laboratory which, in cooperation with state government, has taken major responsibility for managing the data base and supplying demographic data and analysis to various users in the state. Under the co-direction of Glenn Fuguitt and Doris Slesinger, and with a major commitment of time from Voss and Tordella, the Pop Lab not only provides demographic assistance and consultation to data users throughout the state but also carries out an instructional and research program. The Pop Lab and its association with the Wisconsin State Data Center is a model for making information available, which may be more widely adopted in the future. Recently I served with Glenn Fuguitt and Marta Tienda on a National Research Council Panel on Data Needs for Rural Development. One of the major recommendations of the panel was to encourage the organization of a structure in each state similar to that of the Pop Lab/Wisconsin State Data Center.

Although commanding a lesser commitment of resources, the department's extension work in community development, minorities, health and energy have been no less impressive in accomplishment and creativity. Don Johnson and associates have developed some creative techniques for community needs assessment and have employed these in numerous communities in rural Wisconsin. These methods and the results from various communities have been described in a series of extension bulletins.

Doris Slesinger, in addition to her responsibilities with the Pop Lab, has carried out an extensive program of applied research and publication with regard to unmet health care needs, especially among Wisconsin migrant and minority populations. She has worked directly with those populations and produced a series of informational brochures oriented toward the prevention of various contagious diseases.

Marta Tienda has recently carried out two major field projects, one oriented toward more effective extension service to Wisconsin minority populations, and the other a research and development project pertaining to home energy use. Both projects involved not only extensive field work but also publication and numerous public presentations.

A notable feature of the department's extension effort is the extent to which it has remained an integral part of the department and reflects the norms and standards of the department. Those on extension appointment are not isolated from the department either professionlly or spatially. They demonstrate further that there is not necessary contradiction between effectively doing public service work on one hand, and producing professional scholarly publications and retaining their identity as sociologists on the other. The department's extension program, like its research and international effort, gives evidence as well of establishing a focus, and of pursuing that focus with competence and a commitment of resources. Finally, as with the department's research, the extension effort demonstrates a concern for issues of equality and distribution of opportunity.

Service to the Profession

It would be unlikely that a faculty could be as uniformly productive and capable as the UW Rural Sociology faculty without being in great demand for a wide variety of professional positions and assignments. There is no member of the current faculty who has not held major positions of leadership in several professional organizations during recent years. Wisconsin faculty have been especially prominent in the positions they have occupied in the Rural Sociological Society, The International Rural Sociological Association, and in several Latin American sociological organizations.

Faculty members are now, or have at one time been editors, associate editors and editorial board members for no less than 14 different scholarly journals. They have served as consultants to both state and national government agencies, major foundations, state organizations, communities and private citizens.

The Transition: Complete or in Process?

The transition spoken of in the early pages has not appreciably altered the position of the UW Rural Sociology Department among other rural sociology programs in the country. From its beginnings the department has always been at, or near, the top among such programs. In my judgment the transition has produced up to this point a stronger academic department, maintaining a commitment to application of knowledge and policy concerns while simultaneously expanding that commitment to significant effort internationally. A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

faculty has been assembled of uniformly high individual competence and productivity. Research seems to be increasingly oriented toward issues of inequality and public policy. Thus what seems to have emerged out of the uncertainties of the late 1960s and early 1970s is a foundation with a sound record of academic and public service achievement, and with the intellectual resources and institutional setting to pursue new methods and research agendas.

Don Dillman and I have had the experience during the last year of working with a wide range of the membership of the Rural Sociological Society in editing the book Rural Society: Issues for the 1980s. Among the many observations to be made from that experience is how extensive is the range of issues to which the research of rural sociologists might be pertinent. The most difficult part of being editors has been producing the last chapter, in which we attempt to deal with how the research will be accomplished. The pertinent questions are numerous; the number of rural sociology researchers is relatively few. Consequently, if an impact is to be made, the selection of questions for research becomes increasingly more important.

Throughout the book there is general call for more policy-oriented research. How that call is made, however, ranges from recommendations for more research to provide "policy makers" with better information, to research challenging the process by which the policy is made. If that call is to be heeded then, as Lacy and Busch (1981) point out, there is a need for a clear understanding of the methods and processes by which policy is shaped and determined -- a major research agenda item in and of itself. Many of the chapters in the book relate technical issues and problems to actual or anticipated social consequences. That necessitates either interdisciplinary research, or that the rural sociologist becomes well informed in various technical areas. Most of the chapters in the book call for the production of research and information which would likely "make a difference" in some important problem areas. It is not clear from past experience what form our research would need to be produced in to increase the prospects of "making a difference." Simultaneous with the emergence of the above kinds of questions has been a more frequently voiced call for a new critical role for rural sociology (e.g., Newby and Buttel, 1980; Friedland, 1979; Busch and Lacy, 1979). There is no shortage of general issues to which the limited number of rural sociologists might meaningfully address their work during the 1980s.

Based on its record from the first 50 years, I would expect the Department of Rural Sociology at Wisconsin to be building on its strengths and "making a difference" on the above kinds of questions in the future.

References

Blau, Peter M.
1973 The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Busch, Lawrence and W. B. Lacy
1979 "Sources of Influence on Problem Choice in the Agricultural Sciences: The 'New Atlantis' Revisited." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Burlington, Vt.

Clemente, F.
1972 "Measuring Sociological Productivity: A Review and Proposal." American Sociologist 7 (November): 7-8.

Friedland, William H.
1979 "Who Killed Rural Sociology: A Case Study in the Political Economy of Knowledge Production." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Boston, Massachusetts.

Glenn, N.D. and W. Villemez
1970 "The Productivity of Sociologists at 45 American Universities." American Sociologist 5 (August): 244-252.

Grimes, M.D., T.K. Pinhey, and J.A. Phifer
1978 "Departmental Prestige in Rural Sociology: Its Measurement and Comparison with General Sociological Prestige Hierarchy." Rural Sociology 43 (Spring): 7-16.

Lacy, William B. and L.N. Busch
1981 "The Institution and Professional Context for Rural Sociology: Constraints and Opportunities." In Don Dillman and Daryl Hobbs (editors), Rural Society: Issues for the 1980's. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press (forthcoming).

Lightfield, E.T.
1971 "Output and Recognition of Sociologists." American Sociologist 6 (May): 128-133.

Newby, Howard and F.H. Buttel
1980 "Toward a Critical Rural Sociology." In Frederick H. Buttel and Howard Newby (editors), The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies: Critical Perspectives. Montclair, New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun, and Company.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Wileden, Arthur F.
1979 "Early History of the Department of Rural Sociology." Madison: University of Wisconsin, Department of Rural Sociology.

REMINISCENCES OF CULTURAL ARTS IN RURAL SOCIOLOGY

by

Robert E. Gard*

During the Depression I was at Cornell doing graduate work and I'd written a play about the hill country of central New York, which is not very good agricultural country. Unscrupulous real estate interests were sending Dust Bowl people into central New York and selling them pieces of this unproductive land, where they couldn't get along any better than they had been doing down in Oklahoma and Texas, so I wrote a play called "The Wild Hills." I thought it was the best I'd ever done and I took it to my teacher Alek Drummond. He just kept it a long, long time. I didn't know what he was doing with it. Finally I got my courage together and went to see him.

I said, "Professor, do you have my play? What did you think of it?"

"Well," he said, "It's a pretty good play, but what are you going to do with your life? I didn't see anything in this play that indicates to me that you have any outstanding talent as a playwright. But," he said, "I like you. What are you going to do?"

---

*Professor Emeritus, University of Wisconsin-Extension, Madison, Wisconsin.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I said, "Well, as a matter of fact yesterday I had a letter from the President of Sweet Briar College down in Virginia and he offered me a teaching job."

"Don't do that," he said. "I've been in touch with a fellow in New York who's at the Rockefeller Foundation. His name's Dave Stevens. He's head of Humanities there. I want you to take the Black Diamond Express tomorrow morning and go down to New York to see him." I told him I'd be glad to but I hadn't got a cent of money. Drummond said that was no problem and wrote a check for $35, which was plenty of money in those days to go to New York and back.

So I went down to the RCA Building where the foundation had its office. I'd never been to New York City before. I was kind of a raw country boy from Kansas. This wonderful man finally emerged from somewhere and said, "Are you the fellow that Drummond sent?"

I said, "Yes I am."

He said, "How long has it been since you went back to Kansas to see your mother?"

"Well," I said, "It's been quite a while."

He said, "I've got a check here from our financial officer to send you to Kansas to see your mother for two weeks. Then you come back here and we'll make further plans."

I did that and I didn't understand what he was trying to do. I had no idea what was going on. I took some of Drummond's money and sent a telegram to him that afternoon and told him that Mr. Stevens is very fine, but I don't understand what he wants. But I did later. He wanted me to find out where I'd been, I think.

When I went to Cornell I had $30 that I'd borrowed from the Iowa State Bank. That's all the money I had. When I got back to my home town I happened to meet on the street that same banker who'd lent me the money. He said, "What are you doing Gard?"

I said, "I'm with the Rockefeller Foundation now."

And he said, "My boy" -- and he put his arm around my shoulders -- "come on into the bank for a little while. I'd like to talk with you about another loan."

Well, it was that kind of wonderful coincidental chancy thing; I didn't have anything to do with it really. And when I got back to New York, Stevens had another check for me. It was for $400. I said, "What's it for Mr. Stevens?"

He said, "I kind of like you and I think maybe we can get together on something. I was born and raised at Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin and I've always loved the state. I want you to go to Wisconsin and see if there's anything you'd like to do there."

That's absolutely true, I'm not kidding you. So I took his $400 and came to Wisconsin. I remember very well it was a very hot June afternoon in 1944. The war was going on and I'd come up from Chicago on the Northwestern Railroad. The train was full of servicemen and students. I got off at the Northwestern Station and began to walk. I walked up to the Capitol Square and around the Capitol and craned my neck at that wonderful marble edifice, and went on up State Street where I could see this big tall building with a cupola on top of it. The last thing that Stevens had said to me, "When you go to the University of Wisconsin don't go to Bascom

Hall. Just keep on walking until you get to the College of Agriculture."

I couldn't understand why, because to me what I'd been wanting to do in the arts and drama had something to do with Departments of Art and not Colleges of Agriculture. But I went on to Ag Hall anyway. I was lucky enough to stumble on to the office of a great man. His name was Chris L. Christensen. He was a very large man physically, as I remember him, but he was a large man in the way he thought and talked, too. He was sitting at a big desk and on the wall behind him was a big painting of a farmer out in the middle of a field of yellow wheat. The farmer had his arm stretched out. I think he must have been feeling the heads of the wheat -- I'd seen them do this down in Kansas many times to see if it was ready to thresh. Christensen saw me looking at this painting and he said, "That's Curry, he's a Kansas man like you."

I said, "Yes, everybody's heard of John Curry down in Kansas."

He said, "Well, Curry's here. I brought him here. I had to fight like hell with the Art Department to get them to agree to it. But we've got him and he's teaching the rural people how to paint."

And I said, "Well, I'm very interested in that."

"I'll tell you what else I'd like to do," he said. "I'd like poetry to be as important in this state as scientific agriculture."

There was something that really got to me, the way he talked like that. I remember that he took me upstairs to the third floor in Ag Hall -- it was very hot up there, no air conditioning in those days -- to meet a small-statured, bald-headed, very clear-eyed, very penetrating kind of a man. Not especially (and Art Wileden had it right in his paper) not especially warm. This man shook my hand and said, "My name is John Kolb and I'm in Rural Sociology here." Christensen, the Dean, said, "Kolb, you're going to have this young man in your department." Kolb did not object to that.

I was only in the Rural Sociology Department for a short time. They kicked me out of there because at some point, I think, the faculty got to thinking that they weren't pure enough sociologists, and that the Arts didn't really belong there. It was better for me in the long run, but I have never forgotten the kindness that I received from Art Wileden and from John Barton and from Chris Christensen while he remained as Dean. And from John Kolb. They did everything to help me to the point that I was able, during the first year that I was here, to learn some ways of looking at an enrichment of American life, ways that are still going on and increasing in prestige today. Nobody dreamed that there'd ever be a National Endowment for the Arts or for the Humanities. In those days it was only just go out and work like hell and try to get the condition of man to be a little better in the places where he lived. Thank you.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY RESEARCH: THE NEXT TEN YEARS

by

Don A. Dillman*

The more I do research, the less impressed I become with anyone's ability to describe future research needs. If I had been asked to make a presentation of this nature in 1971, I doubt that I would have said anything about the resurgence of growth in rural areas of the United States or an energy crisis. Yet these two issues now dominate our thinking about the future of rural America. I doubt that I would have said much about impending changes in rural women's roles, the sociology of agriculture, rural crime and social impact assessment. Yet each of these areas is now an exceedingly important research concern among rural sociologists. We have just gone through a dramatic decade for United States society as well as rural sociology, and the next decade shows signs of being even more dramatic.

---

*Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociologist, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington. The writing of this paper was partially supported by the Kellogg Foundation Fellowship Program. Appreciation is expressed to Viktor Gecas, William Lassey, John Wardwell, William Freudenburg, Martha Lamberts and Robert Howell for critical reviews of the original manuscript, and to Daryl Hobbs for the many hours of interaction which stimulated development of some of the ideas expressed.

Preparing for this presentation has alternately excited and depressed me. It has excited me because I have never been more impressed with the need for a rural sociological perspective on what is happening in rural United States. The depressed feeling comes from wondering if our discipline is capable of responding to the research issues that are before us, and whether our society will provide the resources required for us to make a meaningful response.

Between my feelings of exhilaration and negativism, I have pondered a multitude of concerns, each of which bear on what our discipline will or will not accomplish during the next ten years. Many of these concerns stem from having spent eight rather long years as department chair during which I have done my share of fretting over how to get more money for research. I have also fretted over how to get scientists to repond to clearly pressing needs instead of simply doing more and more of the same and how to get them to look beyond their regression coefficients to comprehend why our state legislature has a legitimate concern over whether their research has any payoff to the state or nation.

I have been frustrated by rural sociolgists whose idea of a good progress report is to indicate how many questionnaires were collected and how many are yet to be coded. But the frustration usually went higher when I saw journal reprints offered to deans and the general public and mimeographed frequency distributions offered to the discipline as well-intended reports of results. When I have heard scientists decline for the third and fourth time to do research on emerging problems because it does not quite lend itself to a test of his or her major paradigm, I have pondered audaciously, asking whether they have considered finding a new paradigm.

The time spent on these issues was about equal, I suppose, to the time spent trying to convince university officials and legislators to look beyond the "sociology" name plate on the departmental office in order to understand that the problems faced by rural people are more than technological and that rural sociologists have a unique set of skills that are essential to understanding such issues. I have felt considerable frustration sitting in meeting after meeting with colleagues from some of the agricultural disciplines who believe their new methods for controlling soil erosion should be instantly adopted, and that it is somehow the farmer's fault if it does not happen. It is similar to the frustration I have felt at seeing state agencies descend on a community with plans for that community's future and watching their dismay at being rebuffed. I have also experienced dismay watching medical planners who offer bricks and mortar as a solution to rural medical care and become shocked at people's refusal to change long cherished ways of relating to the medical profession which included a desire for a chiropractor.

The experience of having worked for eight years between our discipline and its support environments weighed heavily on my mind as I prepared this paper. As a consequence, I wish to go beyond simply saying what research needs to be done and talk about the conditions that will likely affect whether it gets done. I will place discussion of those conditions in four categories. The first

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

concern is United States society and the Reagan Experiment. Second, I will discuss the sometimes rocky relationship between rural sociology departments and colleges of agriculture. Next, I will discuss relationships with mainline sociology and the professional careers of rural sociologists. The thesis I will develop is that society, departments, our parent discipline, and careers are all forces pulling us into or away from doing meaningful research, and all must be considered in plans for the 1980s. Finally, I want to risk mentioning a few concerns that I hope will receive attention from rural sociologists during the 1980s.

United States Society and the Reagan Experiment

The greatest difficulty of developing a research agenda for the 1980s is not knowing what lies ahead for United States society. My current definition of culture shock, as well as an updated version of the Rip Van Winkle story, is what a Lyndon B. Johnson staff member who went to sleep in 1965 would feel like if he or she were to wake up in January 1981.

Federal government, which in the course of some forty years has ratcheted its way to becoming something for nearly everyone, is in the process of retrenchment. The implicit theme of recent years of a "program for every problem" has given way to a "budget cut for (nearly) every category."

The traditional social science research report starts out by noting that policy makers need certain knowledge in order to formulate programs to solve societal problems. It typically winds up the analysis with an assessment of what needs to be incorporated

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

into the next governmental program. While perhaps not an endangered species, reports of this nature are certainly out of fashion and seem likely to remain that way while we weather the storm of budget cuts being acted on by Congress.

The last place one wants to be in order to get a perspective on storm damage being done to a community is in the basement of one of its houses at the height of the storm. Unfortunately, I am afraid that this is where most of us are just now in our efforts to understand what the Reagan Experiment means to either United States society or the rural portion of its population.

The storm we are experiencing is worse for social scientists than most others. Losing much of the sociology budget at the National Science Foundation (NSF) is frightening. But it is absolutely horrifying to see similar cuts in social science being excised from the United States Departments of Justice, Housing and Urban Development, National Institute of Mental Health, and most other federal agencies. The message being sent to social scientists in the words of an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) official is, "They're vulnerable. We can't see why, if their work is that important, Washington has to be the main source of funds" (Lynch, 1981).

It remains to be seen what will happen as our government moves into uncharted territory of massive budget cuts, and presumably substantial tax cuts, which, taken together, still leaves the United States with an expected deficit of $35 to $55 billion for the coming year. The specter of continued federal deficits on top of continuing high interest rates and inflation may lead one who is a pessimist to take another look at Edward Cornish's prediction of How the Great Depression of the 1980s Might Begin (1979). For an optimistic view of what could be ahead, one might consult Alvin Toffler's The Third Wave (1980) or Herman Kahn's World Economic Development which portrays a future of affluence, barring bad luck or bad management. The only conclusion I feel safe in reaching at this time is that we have moved from high uncertainty in the 1970s to higher uncertainties in the 1980s.

When I have shared these concerns with colleagues, many have responded with a "yes, but . . . ." They have suggested that the recent establishment of distinctly rural interest organizations, such as Rural America and the National Rural Center, and the resurgence of population growth in rural United States will provide the muscle to assure that rural concerns receive attention regardless of how the rest of our society fares. It remains to be seen what the ensuing sessions of Congress will bring, but this has not been the year for any social or quality-of-life concern to receive attention. Most groups, both urban and rural, have had to accept cuts in programs.

As for the much-heralded resurgence of growth in rural places, there are two perspectives from which to evaluate the data. One way is to note that, from 1970 to 1980, nonmetropolitan counties grew much faster than metropolitan counties, adding 15.4 percent to their totals compared to only 9.1 percent for the metropolitan counties. An equally valid way to read the same data is to note that metropolitan counties added 13.6 million people during the decade, while rural counties only added 8.4 million people (Beale, 1981). Despite the turnaround, we became a more urban nation during the 1970s.

As I look at the declines of major metropolitan cities of the Midwest and Northeast which are far closer to the nation's capital than the growth areas of the country, it seems likely that there will be enormous pressures from large cities for federal help during the 1980s. There is an equally enormous potential for support by large numbers of people. Whether rural residents can argue that the real, often acute needs created by growth deserve more attention than the needs created by urban decline remains to be seen.

Having used broad brush strokes to paint a somewhat negative picture, let me suggest with equally broad strokes that I do not view these concerns as necessarily implying a decade lacking in research opportunities for rural sociologists.

First, if the Reagan Experiment works, I doubt that most people will be displeased. Second, the long-standing United States Department of Agriculture/land-grant university relationship developed through the cooperative research system seems philosophically suited for the kind of partnership envisioned by the Reagan Administration for getting things done in our society. The federal/state partnership may result in most rural sociology research positions being continued. There may be an opportunity to utilize this system as the best available means for meeting many of the social science research needs of the nation. In fact, we may be among the few social science researchers to continue receiving support. Third, a time of great change is also a time to look for great opportunity. I find myself trying to anticipate the data gaps that will create great concern within the Reagan Administration and state capitals two or three years down the road. Rural sociologists may be among the few social scientists with continuing funding, modest as it might be, which will enable us to collect and analyze data on societal changes. If we are able to guess right at the inevitable data needs which will surface, rural sociology has an opportunity to serve the nation and strengthen our discipline at the same time.

As an example of these possibilities, the United States Census Bureau is sharply curtailing its efforts to publish needed tabulations. Several departments of rural sociology are gearing up for the analysis and reporting of census data to fill this gap. A society undergoing change can get along for a while without having such information, but not for long. It is an opportunity that needs to be acted upon. If rural sociology can keep its house in order, it promises to be one of the few bright spots in the social science horizon.

A second implication for the 1980s is the need for flexibility and speed in research. Too much of our research has been done by the "five plus two" plan: One year to think about a project, a second year to design it, a third year to implement it, a fourth year to analyze it, and a fifth year to report it. The "plus two" is needed for what is known in the trade as "milking the data." By the time the last data are analyzed, the policy, and often the scientific issue that precipitated the research has long since given way to some other issue. What gets published is often not very interesting, useful or relevant. In a society that is changing so rapidly, we simply cannot afford this cultural lag.

Rural sociology has at its disposal an incredible array of technology, which, if properly used, can dramatically speed up the research process. Among these tools are copy machines, memory typewriters, mail and telephone alternatives to face-to-face interviews and very easy access to high speed computer terminals. Crop scientists may still have to wait out the weather in each year's cropping cycle for their research to progress, but we do not. At times we seem to be no more immune to the adoption curve we applied so successfully to farmers during the last few decades than they were.

Our College of Agriculture Environment

The relationship between rural sociology research and its host colleges of agriculture has often been troubled. A friend once likened it to embedding a small, foreign object in tissue. Sometimes the object disappears from sight never to be heard from again. In other cases, it becomes an irritant that seems far greater than its size,and ejection becomes the quickest and easiest way to get relief. Finally, in a few instances, an interaction takes place and rural sociology becomes a pearl that the college of agriculture takes great care not to lose. I think we have cases of all three outcomes around the United States.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

During the 1960s and early 1970s, we probably had more of the former outcomes than of the latter. Those were the days when rural sociologists and the social sciences came as close to being able to write their own ticket as we will probably experience in our lifetimes. Enrollments in the social sciences skyrocketed, and any Ph.D. who had only one job offer was appropriately viewed with suspicion. President Johnson's attempt to build the Great Society added additional opportunities in government and the private sector. Moreover, the 1960s was an "urban decade," and the best opportunities were defined as working on urban issues. As a result, many Ph.D.s in rural sociology found it convenient to leave "rural" off of their vitae and left the discipline.

For rural sociology, the results were as substantial as they were frustrating. "Rural" became a variable in research rather than an object of study. Most departments carried several projects that had little or nothing to do with rural concerns. New faculty were often "bought" by the offer of twelve-month appointments and routine allocation of research budgets, the advantage of which could easily be seen by aspiring researchers who had little interest in rural people, institutions or communities. An emotionally detached observer could likely see irony in the response of one such researcher who protested being asked to rewrite an experiment station project with, "What's wrong, didn't I mention rural/urban differences enough times?" It was often the same sociologists that provided the college of agriculture's cutting edge for change on everything from long hair to liberal social views.

The extent of rural sociology's psychological separation from colleges of agriculture is illustrated by an informal meeting called during the 1976 annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society. The purpose of the meeting was to see if there was enough interest among members to form a sociology of agriculture interest group in order to stimulate research on agricultural concerns. Such research, astonishing as it might seem, had mostly disappeared from our annual meetings. I should add that this movement has met with incredible success in recent years and is now one of the most dominant concerns among rural sociologists.

In retrospect, I believe that rural sociology would have suffered dramatic losses in the late 1960s and early 1970s had it not been for the rapid enrollment increases then occurring in most universities. In many states research budgets rode the backs of instructional budgets. Many administrators, who were receiving higher budgets, were not generally inclined to weed out departments doing little to meet the colleges' missions. They were more concerned with allocating additional funds to departments which were fulfilling that mission.

As we enter the 1980s, the budget situation is different. Many, if not most, states are facing budget constraints at least as severe as those being encountered by the federal government. University enrollments are either stable or declining. Recently, I received a copy of a memorandum to all deans from my university's executive vice president asking for contingency plans to reduce budgets by a substantial amount for the coming biennium. Among the instructions were directions to consider elimination of programs marginal to the mission of each college. I am quite sure that chairpersons of agronomy, animal science, plant pathology and agricultural economics did not read those instructions with the same care that I did.

However, in many ways I read that paragraph with more interest than actual concern. After eight years of close interaction with deans and directors I have no doubt that our discipline is central to the mission of the college of agriculture. Our discipline offers expertise not found in other departments of most colleges of agriculture. For example:

*Many of the critical issues affecting agricultural production go beyond traditional technical and management considerations. They include population encroachment, agricultural zoning and rural crime. The latter is hypothesized to be a major cause of farmers selling their land for urban uses in one State of Washington county.

*Carefully articulated relationships with clientele and commodity groups are essential to gaining college of agriculture support while avoiding co-optation and ineffective allocation of college resources. Rural sociology offers understanding of the dynamics of intergroup relationships and expertise in group processes which can be applied to working with these groups.

*The adoption of appropriate energy-saving, soil-preserving technology may change from being an option to becoming a national necessity in the next decade. The diffusion of ideas represents one of rural sociology's best-established areas of expertise.

*Understanding changes in the structure of agriculture, such as who is doing the farming, at what scale, using what percent of their time and earning what percent of their livelihood, is essential for development of appropriate farm implements and management procedures. That knowledge is lacking nationally and in most states.

* Involvement in international development programs is often limited by the cultural maladaptation of personnel and methods. The demand for rural sociologists and social analysts on international projects far exceeds our ability to supply them.

Issues such as those outlined above need knowledge found at the core of our discipline, and we have much to contribute. However, our research frequently does not produce the kind of news that others wish to hear, a fact that tends to heighten rather than decrease our importance to the colleges of agriculture. Among our skills is knowledge of the appropriate and inappropriate uses of surveys, and we are usually the only discipline in the college of agriculture that trains students in their use. I am often amazed at how great is the need among other agricultural disciplines for knowledge of the distribution of a characteristic within a population -- something only a scientific survey can supply. Topics range from learning the percent of farmers experiencing crop loss from use of inapproapriate equipment, to reasons for selling agricultural land for non-farm use.

There is some danger that my comments may be interpreted as suggesting that rural sociology should become a servant of the other agricultural disciplines, responding to their bidding and forgetting development of our own theories and concepts. That is not my intent.

Many years ago while interviewing a farmer in southwest Iowa, I asked why he grew certain crops. His answer was clear and simple. "The soybeans are for the landlord, the corn is for the government, the chickens are for my wife, but the hogs -- they're all mine." Had the farmer only grown hogs, I suppose he might have no landlord, no farm, and perhaps no wife. I do not wish to compare our choice of research to how a farmer decides what crops to produce. However, I do wish to suggest that whereas in the 1960s we could get by doing entirely our own thing, I do not think the 1980s are going to be that way. But neither do we have to be the college choreperson. We must find an appropriate balance, and the sooner, the better. One of my revelations as a chairperson was to discover that other departments claim, and often on more legitimate grounds than we do, to be the college choreperson. In finding the necessary balance, I am not suggesting we do anything differently than is being done by most other departments in colleges of agriculture. Whether or not we strike that balance will be a key to our success or lack of it during the stormy decade ahead.

Ties to Our Parent Discipline

Potentially, efforts to pay greater heed to the concerns of the agricultural colleges may weaken our ties to mainline sociology. If

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

this should happen, rural sociology and agriculture will both end up as the losers.

The value of rural sociology to the colleges of agriculture comes primarily from the power of our sociological theories to explain behavior, and from the power of our methods to test those theories. The vast majority of these theories and methods have been developed outside of rural sociology, a situation that will undoubtedly continue. When rural sociologists drop their membership in the American Sociological Association, when our annual meetings are located apart from those of the American Sociological Association so that attendance at the latter is discouraged, and when publication of our research in the numerous journals other than Rural Socioloy wanes, I fear that the fountain that makes us relevant to others may go dry.

Rural sociologists are now studying an incredible array of issues, as evidenced by the large number of diverse issues identified in the recently completed book, Rural Sociology: Issues for the 1980s (Dillman and Hobbs, 1982). This heterogeneity combined with our relative small numbers means that we lack the critical mass to be self sustaining in our specialities, e.g., demography, environmental sociology, community, and gerontology.

My concern over ties to mainline sociology are heightened because of the relative ease with which rural sociologists may let those ties wither and die. The scientific study of people's behavior is usually poorly understood by faculty of other agricultural departments, and by our college administrators. Where this situation prevails and our numbers are few, it becomes easy to hide behind amorphous ideas about attitudes, organizational structures and institutions which our administrators can neither understand nor challenge. Maintaining strong ties to mainline sociology will not ensure our relevance to the mission of our agricultural colleges, but it will help protect us against being irrelevant to that mission.

Careers of Rural Sociologists

Yet another concern with the future of rural sociology stems from the consideration of the normal career patterns of academic professionals, to which rural sociologists are no exception. I once heard the philosopher/longshoreman, Eric Hoffer, comment about his enjoyment of libraries. He frequently visited libraries and searched the stacks for books to read. He noted that an author usually wrote not just one book but many books. He also observed that whereas one book was usually thin and the others were thick, that the thin book was inevitably the first one to be published. Finally, he offered his opinion that, inevitably, the author said everything he knew in the first book and everything he did not know in the remainder! Hoffer's observation suggests the progression that occurs in many people's professional careers.

Early in one's career a breakthrough is experienced. The author produces a set of ideas that helps others understand a phenomenon. A reputation is gained which results in invitations to conferences, workshops, consulting and writing of chapters and monographs instead of articles. The early career struggle of a scientist appears to be finding a paradigm to explain what he/she sees. Later in one's career an equally fervent struggle goes on to find something to study that will allow one to elaborate his/her paradigm. Within the last month, I have talked with two scientists studying how to get people to stop smoking. One of them wants to be able to find the mechanisms that determine whether people smoke. The other has no interest in why people smoke, only in whether changing people's values will result in changed behavior. Both are well-funded. As you might guess, the former is the younger scientist.

The disturbing conclusion I reach is that, if I want new issues researched in new ways, I would much rather invest my money in an untenured assistant professor than a tenured full professor. But the issue goes much deeper than cost.

Recently, I heard the president of a major western university note emphatically that the publication productivity of universty faculty peaks at about 34 years of age, and less than half of one's productivity occurs during the last two-thirds of one's career. We turn out Ph.Ds. at 27, tenure them at about 32, and promote them to full professor at 37 or so. That leaves another quarter century of career ahead of them. Even those with the will to do research, and I think that includes most of us, find ourselves overburdened with committee assignments, professional society responsibilities and an array of other issues that must receive attention.

Without question, paradigms need to be elaborated and the holes filled. Some issues are transitional, while others exist for generations. However, as an administrator few things were more frustrating to me than trying to get an established faculty member to look beyond the horizon of the comfortable niche he or she has created. I am reminded of a comment by Frank Ballard, a former director of the Oregon Extension Service, who said he had never met an extension specialist who could not justify everything he or she was not doing and who would resist mightily all attempts to be blasted out of a well-worn rut. Ballard's comment has equal applicability to researchers.

The single most important thing that will determine the research contribution of rural sociologist during the 1980s is whether we are able to maintain multitudes of theoretical perspectives, Marxist to structural functional. Some have called for the study of individual behavior, and others for the study of the structure of organizations and society. Some researchers have stated the need for surveys, and others for ethnographic studies. The need for conceptual clarification is frequently cited, as is the need for statistical analysis. The need to know the percentage of people having a certain characteristic is cited as often as the need for sophisticated, multiple-variable analyses. The research needed in some regions of the country is very different from that called for in other regions. The kind of research called for with respect to one institution is quite different from that called for on another institution. Some areas of research are as new to rural sociology as others are old. There is a richness of diversity among rural sociologists and rural sociological research that had not been apparent to me when we began the editing task.

Certain issues identified in Rural Society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980s (Dillman and Hobbs, 1982) would not have been there if it had been written ten years ago. Most noticeable in this regard are the chapters on energy and the reversal of rural migration loss. Both of these issues transcend most of the book's other chapters. Without doubt, they are major factors setting the personal research agendas of many rural sociologists throughout the United States.

A number of other issues clearly surfaced during the last decade. Among them:

- Rural women changed from being viewed as simply a factor in farm production to becoming an important object of study as a farmer or farm partner. (Haney, Chapter 12)
- The rural elderly led the population turnaround in some regions of the country, producing unanticipated economic benefits as well as service needs that are not yet well understood. (Lee and Lassey, Chapter 9)
- The rural countryside emerged as the most preferred place to live and the place where strongly observed housing norms could most readily be satisfied. (Morris and Winter, Chapter 19) At the beginning of the decade preferences were a novelty; at

the close of the decade, serious efforts were being made to integrate preferences into models of migration behavior. (Zuiches, Chapter 24)

* The wholesale application of urban models of education to rural places was brought into question, raising a host of research questions. (Parks, et al., Chapter 18)

* Rural crime grew dramtically, raising many perplexing issues, one of which stems from the fact that farm buildings have usually been built to keep out the weather and not people. (Phillips, et al., Chapter 23)

* It became amply evident that rural minorities, including American Indians, Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Mormons and Amish face distinctly different issues from one another as well as from their urban counterparts. Specification of the issues is in itself a research issue. (Kuvlesky, et al., Chapter 11)

* Transportation is the life line of rural United States, but has almost totally been ignored by rural sociologists. (Kaye, Chapter 15)

* The markedly successful line of research on individual aspirations and achievements of rural youth continues, but recognition of the job market limitation has led to research on what determines the opportunities available to them. (Falk, Chapter 10)

* Government created social impact assessment, a new area of research which gave rise to much needed studies of dramatic community change, particularly in the West. (Freudenburg, Chapter 29)

* For agriculture, the 1970s was characterized as the decade in which "all hell broke loose" regarding who was attempting to control agriculture in the United States. Changes in who is doing the farming resurfaced as an important issue. (Stockdale, Chapter 31; Rodefeld, Chapter 32)
* Five models for doing needs-assessment surveys emerged, most of them developed by rural sociologists, providing a battery of alternatives for community development professionals. (Burdge, Chapter 27)
* Water is characterized as the ultimate resource because it has no alternatives, emerging as a candidate for the United States' next resource crisis. (Francis, Chapter 37)
* Appropriate technology received attention from many sectors of society, and a specter of massive changes in how work gets done appeared on the horizon, perhaps to become a dominant issue in the coming decade. (Lodwick and Morrison, Chapter 5)

The authors and critical reviewers of the forty-one chapters have articulated a multitude of concerns that need to be addressed, only a few of which are enumerated above. The chapter authors have produced a rich agenda of ideas for research, but it should not be considered the agenda for 1980s' research. No matter how imaginative they might have been, it is an impossibility to state all of the important research issues that will emerge in the 1980s. To do so would require a clairvoyance that mortals lack.

Even if all of the important issues had been stated, it is doubtful that all of them will get researched; the research needs pertaining to rural United States far outstrip the resources available for response. Researchers will be forced to set priorities. In doing so I hope they will be influenced by the following considerations.

Building on Strengths. A discipline does not progress by studying everything, particularly if it tries to do it all at once. That department that tries to research most of the general topics included in Rural Society: Issues for the 1980s is likely to do a lot of research, but little of significance. Priorities must be determined. In doing so, it would be a serious mistake to ignore areas of established strength.

Recently, I had occasion to review the research done on the resurgence of growth in rural areas during the 1970s. I was amazed at how much and how quickly rural sociologists responded to an issue on which there was no general awareness until 1975. This issue is of concern to our entire society, but rural sociologists have made most (but certainly not all) of the major contributions to our understanding of it. The two recent books on the topic, by Sofranko and Williams (1980) and Brown and Wardwell (1981), are by rural sociologists and include the works of other rural sociologists. The reason we now know a substantial amount about the causes of the turnaround and are not just now beginning the search for explanation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is obvious. Most rural sociology departments already had existing programs in population research, as well as other faculty trained in demography. It is one of our traditional areas of strength, and to do meaningful research on the population turnaround meant adjusting priorities, not establishing them and starting from scratch.

The 1980s may provide an opportunity for us to respond from another area of traditional strength. Rural sociologists are better known to many people for research on the diffusion of information and adoption of practices than for any other expertise. During the 1970s, this area of research lost identity, and sessions devoted exclusively to it became less frequent at our annual meetings. A major factor contributing to this demise was probably the perception of it being an elitist kind of research, the results of which most benefited large, wealthy farmers. The benefactors of adoption/diffusion research were seen as individuals and not the society as a whole. One indication of its decline in importance is the fact that it was not among the topics recommended for inclusion in Rural Society: Issues for the 1980s.

Several considerations lead me to think that a resurgence of this research may lie on the horizon. In the last few years, I have heard agricultural leaders talk in disquieting terms about the necessity of bringing entirely new kinds of farm equipment on line if control of soil erosion is to become a reality and we are to respond to changes in energy availability and cost. I have also heard many national leaders talk about the absolute necessity of energy conservation, regardless of the scenario one believes to be best for meeting future energy needs. This means that retrofitting homes for conservation and adopting other new technologies throughout our society is essential. The Reagan Administration wants to provide quicker depreciation schedules for business, presumably in order to encourage a quicker transformation to the modern technology necessary for meeting foreign industrial competition. The development of new tools to influence adoption, such as tax credits in the case of solar and other technology, is a part of the current scene. We have reached a time in our society when adoption of new technology is coming to be viewed in terms of national necessity rather than just individual gain. I hope that rural sociologists will give careful consideration to these emerging issues in their plans for future research. Our experience with adoption/diffusion research is one of many areas of expertise that may lead us to do some but not other research during the 1980s.

A Mismatch Between Researcher Location and Research Needs.

It has been suggested that if a line were drawn from Ithaca, New York to St. Paul, Minnesota, to Columbia, Missouri, to Lexington, Kentucky, and back to Ithaca, it would encompass more than three-fouths of the rural sociologists with active research programs. This area, once the location of the country's most dramatic rural changes, is remote from the locations of many of the greatest rural changes. As a result, many issues of vital importance to rural people may simply be ignored by our profession.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An example is the water issue. Very few rural sociologists now have active research programs in the area, despite the fact that our nation seems to be sitting on a time bomb. It is not yet clear what water issues will surface first and most forcibly, but one cannot help be concerned at the incredible mobility of our population to coastal areas of the South and all areas of the West. Water resources are simply not available to support the demands now being projected for these regions. The potential problems were recently dramatized by the media which juxtaposed news of sink holes in Florida with rationing of the Colorado River. Add to this the mining of water from once plentiful aquifers such as the Ogallala, competition between hydroelectric needs and irrigation in the West, and the potentially enormous need for water in order to exploit oil shale, and the result is a tremendous potential for dramatic effects on the lives of rural people.

The mismatch between our research resources and location of issues seems likely to also affect the amount of research done on minority issues, rural poverty, social impact assessments in boom town areas, forestry, and certain aspects of corporate agriculture. As a discipline, we need to be sensitve to this mismatch and find ways of addressing these important issues through regional and interregional cooperation. The regional project system of the USDA Science and Education Administration -- Cooperative Research represents an excellent opportunity that must be used to our fullest advantage.

Relating Major Societal Trends to Research Topics. There is no doubt that many societal trends are occurring which must influence specific research. Two trends frequently mentioned in this paper are the population turnaround and changes in energy costs. Many researchers are amply aware of and doing research on these issues. However, it is questionable whether those doing research in traditional areas such as family, gerontology, minorities, food and nutrition, communities, and health and medical care are well informed about them. It takes considerable time for such changing conditions to work their way into paradigms of such researchers, many of whom feel they have little relevance to the specificity of their work.

Another societal trend is the change in approach to problems being fostered by the Reagan Administration. In the past, much research was done because it was deemed necessary in order to develop a program to solve a problem. It now sounds hollow to talk about program formulation implications of our research. Yet it is not clear to whom or how implications need to be addressed. We are in a transitional period and need to be sensitive to it.

In Search of a Balanced Perspective. Research directions are not changed overnight. The typical career patterns of scientists and the time required to develop meaningful programs of research mitigate against quick and decisive changes in direction. This state of affairs led a harried administrator/colleague to note ruefully that the research program he directed always produced half

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of what was necessary when the results were really needed and several times as much research when the results were no longer needed. I wonder if a few years from now our discipline will be producing volumes of material on the population turnaround and the structure of agriculture long after interest in the issues have subsided, at which time the return from each piece of such research will be quite small. If so, we will return to the problem of the present and past decades of how to change our research priorities.

During the 1980s, I expect that we will continually be pressed to articulate the relevance of each of our research projects to not just rural people but to agriculture. Certainly such issues should have a high priority. However, I hope that we do not respond to the extent of leaving behind our concern with many social issues to which we felt equally great pressure to respond during the 1960s and 1970s.

Last summer, I had an opportunity to return to the southern Iowa farm community where I spent the first eighteen years of my life. My father took me on an afternoon ride over virtually all the familiar roads surrounding the home where I grew up and provided a running commentary on the changes in ownership, family composition and lifestyles. In some ways that community has become my referent point for assessing the effects of the last forty years of change in rural America. I recognize that one neighborhood among thousands can be nothing more than a personal referent for change; yet the opportunity for longitudinal observation in a society that seems structured in an effort to prevent it provided an unusual opportunity for speculation. We discussed the life changes experienced by the families of the community, and I thought a great deal about the displacement for farm families by expanding farm sizes and the lack of local employment opportunities for children, most of whom had departed for the cities as I had. Because of it being a neighborhood where those who remain talk about the successes and frustrations of one another's children, friends and neighbors, I was able to hear about the lives of far more people than now live there. I was struck by the fact that the description of the people's problems, young and old alike, was far more frequently associated with teenage parenthood than any other single issue that I could identify. The low incomes of that area of the country seem to have caused far less acknowledged pain and suffering than did the traumas of raising grandchildren as one's own children and dealing with the blocked opportunity structure of the single parent.

This incident reminded me that the most popular publication to come out of the Washington State University Department of Rural Sociology during the last ten years was a twenty-six page bulletin by F. Ivan Nye entitled "The Consequences of School-Age Parenthood." Because of reprinting by other states, we do not know how many have been distributed, but are sure that it is well in excess of 100,000 copies. For a time, it exceeded in distibution any other single bulletin available from Washington State University. I do not wish to conclude that teenage parenthood is one of the two or three most pressing issues facing rural America.

However, I do maintain that there is more to rural people's quality of life than amount of income, how they make a living, the variety of community services available to them and how they relate to the natural environment.

I believe it would be a mistake for rural sociologists to be swept along with the winds now buffeting our discipline and forget the concerns we have addressed in the past. Rural sociology has always been concerned with a multitude of concerns facing rural people, and I hope that the wholeness of our orientation will continue.

References

Beale, Calvin L.
1981 Rural and Small Town Population Change, 1970-80. Economics and Statistics Service, USDA EES-5, February.

Brown, David L. and John Wardwell (editors)
1981 New Directions in Urban-Rural Migration: The Population Turnaround in Rural America. New York: Academic Press.

Cornish, Edward
1979 "The Great Depression of the 1980s: Could It Really Happen?" The Futurist 13(5):353.

Dillman, Don A. and Daryl J. Hobbs (editors)
1982 Rural Society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980s. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Kahn, Herman
1979 World Economic Development. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks.

Lynch, Mitchell
1981 "Cuts Raise a New Social-Science Query: Does Anyone Appreciate Social Science?" The Wall Street Journal, Friday, March 27, p. 48.

Nye, F. Ivan
1977 School-Age Parenthood: Consequences for Babies, Mothers, Fathers, Grandparents, and Others. Extension Bulletin 667, Cooperative Extension Service, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.

Sofranko, Andrew J. and James D. Williams (editors)
1980 Rebirth of Rural America: Rural Migration in the Midwest. North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Toffler, Alvin
1980 The Third Wave. New York: Bantam Books.

AGRARIAN STUDIES AND POLITICAL ECONOMY:
CHALLENGES FOR RURAL SOCIOLOGY

by

Harriet Friedmann*

Events of the last decade catapulted the farmer from cameo role to leading player. His -- and sometimes her -- relations to consumers and to the state have become a major subplot of political dramas everywhere. On the international stage, changing East-West relations and emerging North-South relations often take place through grain embargoes, food import dependence and food aid (Brandt, 1980; Friedmann, forthcoming). On national and regional stages, agricultural support policies and environmental questions have become heated issues in Europe and North America. In the underdeveloped world, agriculture has replaced industry as the focus of national and international policy debate. There, as in the centrally planned economies, notably Poland, food prices have become a focus of social conflict.

In response, whole issues of interdisciplinary social science journals are devoted to the "crises" of food and agriculture (_International Organization_, 1978; _World Development_, 1977), and books defining a "crisis" for the public consciousness multiply (George, 1976; Hopkins and Puehala, 1980; Lappe, _et al._, 1980; Lappe

---

*Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and Collins, 1979). Indeed, crisis literature is one of the few growth industries at the moment. Perhaps surprisingly, in the recent discovery of food and agriculture as a pressing problem, little of the accumulated body of rural sociology (or agricultural economics) has entered explicitly into this literature. It would be reassuring to suggest that this represents the usual divide between popular and scientific publics and practitioners. No doubt this is partly true.

Yet there is reason to doubt that this is the whole story, and in this lies the challenge for rural sociology. Long before food and agriculture became fashionable subjects, new intellectual developments of the 1960s and 1970s led scholars in the whole range of the social sciences to reformulate questions formerly left to rural sociology and agricultural economics. Analysts of social class, political movements, community organization, the labor process, demography and international relations have increasingly (if I may shift metaphors) poached in these subdisciplinary forests, often without noticing. The point of intersection of the studies relevant here may be called agrarian. The collection of approaches lending potential conceptual unity may be called political economy.

As the intellectual division of labor has come under pressure, the family farm and the rural community have begun to emerge from the obscurity of narrow academic specialization. Yet in their new interdisciplinary settings, they may be barely recognizable. Rural sociology has in turn opened its own questions and begun its own auto-critique. The challenge is imposing and exciting (Newby, 1978;

Buttel & Newby, 1980).

The Separate and Unequal Status of Rural Life in Postwar Sociology

The contributions of rural sociology to the larger discipline have been very important, as we heard yesterday, yet not always obvious because of the peculiar privilege accorded to matters urban and industrial. As a substantive area, the place of agriculture and rural life in the overall scheme of postwar social science was separate and parallel to each specialization. The dominant integrative approach, functionalism (with its variant, modernization), and the major research orientations such as the Chicago School emphasized the urban/rural divide. This distinction was asymmetrical almost by definition. What little Marxist research survived, de-emphasized but did not challenge the subordination of anachronistic rural life to the dynamism of the cities.

The distinctive feature of the modernization problematic was the division between modern and backward societies, often conceived as poles of a continuum. The measures of modernization invariably included or presupposed the decline of agriculture and rural society. Modern societies were those characterized by cities and industry, and backward ones had vast peasant masses, who perversely reproduced themselves at a rate that constantly frustrated the best efforts of international agencies and national governments to increase their literacy, their need for achievement, their value transformation and in general their suitability for industrial employment and citizenship -- and, of course, the productivity of agriculture. The refusal to become modern men (always in the 1950s,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

men) led the peasant masses to refuse new techniques. They thus brought upon themselves rural unemployment and all the related horrors of backwardness.

The critique of the dependency school is well-known and I shall not review it here. Instead, I should like to point out some implications not usually noted of both approaches, and suggest that one of the several routes through which this important but conceptually limited debate was superseded was through a fresh approach to agriculture and rural life in all types of society.

By accepting the same division of countries into developed and underdeveloped, though not the explanation for the origins or perpetuation of the division, both the modernization and the dependency approaches tended to dismiss agriculture as a positive area of research. To be sure, the modernists understood the increased productivity of agriculture to be a precondition for urbanization and industrialization. The prototypical cases of agriculture in England and the United States, however, were of mainly statistical interest, indicating the relation between increased productivity and a shift of population to urban areas and industrial employment. The dependistas, in this as in so much, improved over their opponents and ultimately inspired new departures, but shared the basic problem. A large agricultural sector remained a sign of underdevelopment; primary commodity exports remained a mechanism of dependency and the complementary import of manufactured goods, a mechanism of transfer of surplus to developed countries. In the heat of debate, little notice was taken by either party of Denmark or New Zealand, and even less of the startling and increasing importance of grain exports for the American -- and even the French -- economy. In other words, residence and geography, not social relations or commodity production, were definitive.

The conceptual subordination of agriculture and rural communities within mainstream social science was also evident elsewhere. For the major studies of demography and occupational mobility, rural areas and farms were the source of migrants; urban life and stratification within industrial and service sectors were dynamic and interesting; rural communities were to decline, and the grace or otherwise with which they did so was left to specialists to describe. The latter not surprisingly tended to become advocates either of the supposed traditional virtues of rural society or of programs to alleviate rural poverty.

The tradition of the Chicago School, with its emphasis on regional hierarchies and the dominance of larger over smaller population centers, reinforced the inclination to leave matters rural and agricultural to those with particular interests in the matter and institutional bases of their own. Edgar Thompson's (1975) focus on plantation society is a notable exception, and his historical grounding continues to inspire important work (Mandle, 1978; Wright, 1978; see also Friedmann, 1980b). Agriculture and rural life thus tended to be interesting outside rural sociology only to the extent that they refused to exhibit the expected rate of decline.

The Substantive Departure: Agrarian Studies

The agrarian road to reconceptualization had at least two independent origins. One was the rethinking of the history of advanced capitalist societies, sometimes as part of an attack on mechanical Marxism, at others as a part of a creative renewal of Marxist analysis. It involved a convergence of social science and history, to the benefit of both, and with the inevitable recognition of the (now) obvious: that precapitalist formations were enormously diverse, even within national economies which themselves were historical creations; that the unifying character could only be described as agrarian; that the ultimate differences in social structure and political forms must bear at least some relation to historically precedent relations of production and power more or less closely tied to agriculture; that patterns of class formation and industrialization varied and continue to vary among regions and countries; and that the agrarian sectors, sometimes modern and sometimes backward, often remain crucial in advanced capitalism (Newby, 1977; Friedland, Barton and Thomas, 1981; Pfeffer, 1980; Mooney, 1979).

The demographic and economic aspects of capitalist development in England were subjected to critical scrutiny by Peter Laslett and his associates in the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure (Laslett, 1965). The focus on household production linked several previously separate areas of research in such a way as to undermine many of the premises of prevailing sociological theory. The patriarchal family of 16th to 18th century

England was often a combined kinship and consumption group and productive enterprise. Labor beyond that produced by the family was organized through patriarchal relations of apprenticeship and service. Commodity relations were only partly developed, since labor subsisted in large part through participation in household consumption and since prices were often politically regulated. Yet commodity relations and pauperism were developing within the precapitalist framework of English society. At the same time, the political unification of the nation was interwoven with the social and geographical extension of the market and involved complex changes in the form and structural location of elites and privileged classes.

All this epochal change occurred in a society which was largely rural. Land remained the principal source of wealth and power but was itself undergoing a tranformation basic to the rise of capitalism and therefore of industry. From a precapitalist, especially political, resource, land was becoming increasingly a form of property in the strict economic sense. Land which was becoming only one form of property quantitatively related to other forms, was in this way becoming capital. Where wealth previously derived from power resting on status, that is on titles attached to landed property, power increasingly took new forms and derived from wealth, of which the land was one of many possible sources.

And within precapitalist, largely rural society, the preconditions for capitalist relations were also emerging from another direction. Despite the self-conscious attempt to provide an alternative to Marx, Laslett's data show the rise of the raw material for the working class within the household economy. Paupers, those who could find no place to do productive labor, and laborers themselves, grew in numbers and provided the potential counterpart to the emergence of capital. Most wage laborers worked in agriculture, or in capitalist enterprises such as mines, located in rural areas. Some historians within the School, like the French Annales tradition on which they sometimes draw, are explicit in their search for the elements of later capitalism within household economy (Levine, 1977). In France, where rural industrialization was consistently more important than in England, the rural sources of capitalist relations are more evident. The complex interplay of family and work relations in the countryside took its own form, in the emergence of specifically French capitalism (Tilly and Scott, 1978; Scott, 1974).

Interest in the political aspects of capitalist development involved renewed attention to nation-building (C. Tilly, 1975), in particular the revival of the German historical school of such figures as Max Weber and Otto Hintze. This tradition had carried on in specific works which themselves became classics, such as Gerschenkron's (1943) analysis of the interplay of rural class politics, economic policy and the ultimate rise of Nazism. In my view, the most important single work in this revival was Barrington Moore's Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, with its revealing subtitle, Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World. There is no clearer example of the focus on the agrarian roots of the structural variations of modern societies. Other works in this tradition, which in principle encourages unique analyses, are linked by a focus on structure. Schurmann's brilliant, idiosyncratic and provocative Logic of World Power (1974), had at least one of its roots in his earlier studies of the politics of agrarian China. It was in turn an influence on such diverse writers as Block (1977) and Skocpol (1979). The latter, a student of Moore, is specific about the importance of agrarian class relations in determining revolutionary transformations of politics and society.

The other, more specialized origin of contemporary work on agrarian structures goes under the misleadingly narrow (and imprecise) name of peasant studies (see Ennew, et al. 1977; Friedmann 1980a). This new interdisciplinary area represents the convergence of several analytical departures of the 1960s. Its origins in the revival of Marxism, especially among French philosophers and anthropologists, deserves special attention in a moment. The substantive origins of peasant studies lay in attempts to resolve problems within dependency theory on one side and within neoclassical economics on the other.

Within sociology, an important development from dependency theory was the world-economy approach of Wallerstein (1979). This especially emphasized the initial conditions of capitalism and therefore its agrarian origins. The global perspective so strongly insisted upon focused attention on the spatial dimensions of uneven development within the world system. It thus highlighted the vast agrarian context of the initial rise of commodity relations and wage relations, and the continued importance of agriculture in different ways even in areas with the most fully developed labor markets; even proletarians in late 19th century Europe and America typically supplemented their wages through access to allotments and often the keeping of animals. Agriculture, though subordinated to the capitalist mode of production in historically and geographically specific ways, remains crucial to an understanding of the world economy.

Similarly, more systematic and fine-grained work integrating the world economy, productive organization and class relations and politics came from economic historians critical of the limitations of neoclassical models. Gavin Wright's work (1978) is of particular interest to American rural sociology. His analysis of antebellum slavery and of postbellum household production in the American South is exemplary in its positive conceptualization of the rationality specific to noncapitalist productive structure, in conjunction with the specific position of the American South in the world cotton market. Other work by both economic historians and sociologists has contributed to making the southern United States an important area for developing concepts of wider interest in agrarian studies, such as debt peonage (Ransom and Sutch, 1972) and populist politics (Schwartz, 1976). Other interdisciplinary work on share-cropping and migrant labor (e.g., Burawoy, 1976) have used American and Third World data.

Within the broad area called peasant studies, the history of agriculture within societies now considered "advanced" has come to be increasingly important as supposed contrasts to underdeveloped countries have come into question. This is the counterpart to the focus on agrarian class relations and state structures re-introduced by Barrington Moore and overlaps with that intellecutal development. This area of work has its institutional focus in The Journal of Peasant Studies. There, much of the early debate centered on the divergent theories of Lenin (1908) and Chayanov (1966), both stemming from detailed empirical studies of the Russian peasantry. Out of this debate came a web of issues and a flood of empirical research addressing them. These included a concern to understand the basic principles and historical variations of family labor enterprises in all types of economy and the processes through which land and labor in particular came to form part of capitalist development, or resist it (Shanin, 1972; Wolf, 1966; Mayhew, 1972; Friedmann, 1978, 1980 forthcoming). For situations involving a landlord class, the concept of the manor was the object of critical and comparative analysis (Kay, 1974; Kula, 1962). Kautsky's (1899) classical analysis provided departures for rethinking contemporary problems, such as worker-peasants (Franklin, 1969); Servolin, 1972). And the politics and ideologies of agricultural classes in both advanced and underdeveloped parts of the world came to be the focus of scholarly attention (Newby, 1977; Wolf, 1969; Smith, 1979; Stinchcombe, 1965; Paige, 1976). These are a few, almost arbitrary, examples, since an adequate summary would be long and controversial.

The Theoretical Departure: Political Economy

The 1960s and 1970s witnesses a renewal and diversification of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Marxism, including the attempt to develop concepts for precapitalist social relations. Perhaps the best-known, most influential and most problematic was the rise of French structural Marxism. Its chief contribution, in my view, was an insistence on conceptual rigor at any price -- including some, such as history, that many, including me, were ultimately unwilling to pay. In anthropology, the peoples of underdeveloped countries were situated in relation to capitalism and colonialism through the concept of articulation of modes of production (Rey, 1973). Sociologists Hindess and Hirst (1975), in their extreme Althusserian phase, developed rigorous models of precapitalist modes of production.

From the opposite direction, Marxist historians tried to develop concepts of political economy and modes of production in the course of doing history. Anderson (1974a,b) drew on the concepts without formal elaboration to elucidate European history before the rise of capitalism and restricted his formal theory to comparative historical analysis. Both anthropologists and sociologists sought to understand and generalize from particular transitions from communal to commodity relations. Meillassoux (1981) undertook a materialist reformulation of Levi-Strauss, which has been called "the alimentary structures of kinship," and Bernstein (1979) coined the ugly but expressive word "commoditization" for the economic and political mechanisms through which village organization is transformed into households, competitively producing commodities and individuals selling labor power.

The focus on productive relations conceptually separate from, but actually embedded in larger economies, both "social formations" and world markets, led to emphasis on the productive unit. This is often, but not consistently, referred to as the form, in contrast to the mode, of production (Foster-Carter, 1978; Friedmann, 1980, 1978b). This allows for useful developments of neoclassical economics. In the now classical literature, this was central to Chayanov's theory of the peasant economy, which was expressed vaguely in Marxist language (e.g., self-exploitation), but easily translates into that of neoclassical economics (Millar, 1970). The specific rationality of partial subsistence households includes non-monetary calculations (Wright, 1978) and often results in "perverse" price responses (Bell, 1974; Byres, 1974). These studies are not by Marxists, but converge with the extension of Marxism to non-capitalist productive units. Both are part of the project to conceptualize them positively, not as "deviations" from market principles.

The focus on household production provides conceptual links between agrarian structures and the larger society. On one side, the concept of simple commodity production requires development (Morishima and Catephores, 1975). This includes family enterprises in cities as well as on farms, and the mobility among sectors and over time of individuals belonging to family enterprises. Historical analysis of household production, then, involves demographic analysis of sectors characterized by family enterprises (Friedmann, 1978b), of family strategies for inheritance (Easterlin, 1961) and of changes in the family attendant on its changing relation to production (Laslett, 1977). On the other side, the rigor of political economy allows for the reformulation of old conceptions and their integration into a more comprehensive theory. For example, Wolf's (1966) distinction between peasants and family farmers on the basis of motivation can now be turned around; a focus on commodity relations provides a stronger basis for his case for specific forms of linkage to the larger society, and allows for a material explanation for the real choices that structure apparent motivations.

Finally, some of the most complex questions of political economy, such as rent, are beginning to benefit from the convergence of approaches. From political economy, the revival of Marxist economics in England (best known through the "value controversy") has inspired a rethinking of ground rent, of the place of agriculture in the capitalist economy and of the full development of land as capital (Murray, 1978; Fine, 1979, 1980; Ball, 1980). Since land turns out to involve more than its share of limits to complete abstraction as value, and consequently tends to be highly subject to specific political interventions, the conceptual development has depended more than usually on historical analysis. The major work on land as capital, and especially as a form of value with specific consequences for speculation and for crises, draws on English history (Massey and Catalano, 1978). Important contributions to the theory of rent draw on exceptional cases, such as that of the Canadian agricultural frontier (Richardson, 1981).

Together, political economy and macrohistorical research create a new basis for holism, incorporating within a theoretically coherent and historically open-ended approach the productive unit (or enterprise) and its sectoral, national and international relations, together with attendant politics. My own research draws on both recent traditions; indeed, even the definition of the issues would not have been possible without them. This involves the study of a specific sector, wheat production, linking family farmers of the Great Plains through competitive relations with farmers in other countries, and through commercial relations, however mediated, with consumers throughout the world. National politics are often greatly affected by these relations, such as the tension between agricultural support prices and consumer costs in Europe. The food dependence of the underdeveloped world is a matter of increasing concern, and follows rather directly from the aid and trade structures, highly determined by United States policies, of the 1950s and 1960s. From the point of view of political economy, this dependence, and the mechanisms for extending the commodification of food into formerly self-sufficient peasant economies, are fulcrums of capitalist penetration (see Frobel, et al., 1980). The extension of simple commodity production (commercial family farms) in agriculture was the counterpart of proletarianization. Both were unevenly distributed geographically. The commodification of food, therefore, is basic to understanding the international division of labor, with attendant national class formation and regional politics, and potential consequences for accumulation within the world economy.

The Challenge for Rural Sociology

The revival of historical sociology and political economy have brought back into the mainstream of social science matters once left to rural sociology and agricultural economics. The family farm, now understood as simple commodity production; the intensification of commerical agriculture by households, now understood as commoditization; the fate of rural communities, now understood through concepts such as ground rent; all have been revived as comparative historical questions by agrarian studies, and all are potentially grounded in a unifying theory. Moreover, the questions always central to rural sociology and agricultural economics have come to the fore in more general terms through historical analysis and political economy: the labor process, technological change and the politics of class and region.

Vast and exciting areas of research lie before us. I think that the developments I have outlined will be enhanced through reanalysis by rural sociology of the corpus of findings of half a century of research. The task is to situate existing knowledge within these inter-disciplinary problematics, in order both to evaluate and reformulate the problematics, and to identify empirical lacunae from this new vantage point.

In my view, sociolgists are particularly well-equipped for this project. Economists, despite heroic exceptions, are bound by the eternal equilibrium of the market. The elegant conception tends to become in the literature not merely "normal" but even "moral." As Thompson's work so elegantly shows, sociologists must guide

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

economists out of the trap of measuring exceptions to the market and lead the way towards alternative models of productive relations, rationalities and communal forms.

Anthropologists are very good at understanding the specificities of societies and communities not governed by commodity relations, but have trouble with commodity relations themselves. Indeed, despite their own heroic exceptions, the focus on the specific is so great that it tends to verge on the exotic. Peoples analytically constituted as entirely separate and different from ourselves are difficult to include within a unifying conceptual framework. The forging of links among ethnographies tends to promote a rather unsatisfying and simplistic cultural or technical evolutionism. Though we share Durkheim with the anthropologists, sociology also has Weber and Marx.

While it would be foolhardy and presumptuous to predict where such work by rural sociologists would lead, still I think that cetain promising trends are already visible. One is the study of commodity systems, and another is the analysis of class formation. French sociologists of agriculture have developed the useful conception of the agro-industrial complex, which incorporates both (Chombart de Lauwe, 1979; Molard, 1978). In North America, commodity systems are being traced out by Friedland and his associates for fruits and vegetables, and by Ehrensaft and his associates in Quebec for dairy products. Class formation, including regionalism based on farmer politics, are part of the new historical sociology (Finegold, 1980; Finegold and Skocpol, 1980), and the new political economy (Mooney, n.d.). And class formation in the world economy is a project whose natural point of substantive departure is agrarian, whether for understanding slavery and share-cropping in the world cotton market, or for my own project of understanding family farms and merchant companies in the world wheat market. The most dynamic areas of sociology are open to those who attend to agrarian questions.

References

Anderson, Perry

1974a Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism. London: New Left Books.

1974b Lineages of the Absolutist State. London: New Left Books.

Ball, Michael

1980 "On Marx's Theory of Agricultural Rent: A Reply to Ben Fine." Economy and Society 9(3):304-26.

Bell, Clive

1974 "A Note on 'Perverse' Produces Responses to Changes in Prices." In David Lehmann, ed., Agrarian Reform and Agrarian Reformism. London: Faber and Faber.

Bernstein, Henry

1979 "Concepts for the Analysis of Contemporary Peasantries." The Journal of Peasant Studies 6(4).

Block, Fred L.

1977 The Origins of International Economic Disorder. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Brandt, Willy

1980 North-South, A Program for Survival. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Burawoy, Michael

1976 "The Functions and Reproduction of Migrant Labor: Comparative Material from Southern Africa and the United States." American Journal of Sociology 81(5):1051-1087.

Buttel, Frederick H. and Howard Newby

1980 The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies. Montclair, N.J.: Allanheld, Osmun.

Byres, T.J.

1974 "Land Reform, Industrialization and the Marketed Surplus in India: An Essay On the Power of Rural Bias." In David Lehmann, ed., Agrarian Reform and Agrarian Reformism. London: Faber and Faber.

Chayanov, A.V.

1966 On the Theory of Peasant Economy. Homewood, Ill.: American Economic Association Translation Series. Ed. by D. Thorner, B. Kerbley, R.E.F. Smith.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Combart de Lauwe, Jean
1979 L'Aventure agriceole de la France de 1945 a nos jours. Paris: Presses Universitaires de la France.

Easterlin, Richard A.
1961 "Influences in European Overseas Emigration Before World War I." Economic Development and Cultural Change 9:331-351.

Ennew, Judith, Paul Hirst, and Keith Tribe
1977 "'Peasantry' as an Economic Category." The Journal of Peasant Studies 4(4):295-322.

Fine, Ben
1979 "On Marx's Theory of Agricultural Rent." Economy and Society 8(3):241-78.

1980 "On Marx's Theory of Agricultural Rent: A Rejoinder." Economy and Society 9(3):327-31.

Finegold, Kenneth
1980 "From Agrarianism to Adjustment. The Political Origins of New Deal Agricultural Policy." Presented at the Social Science History Association, Rochester, N.Y., Nov. 7-9.

Finegold, Kenneth and Theda Skocpol
1980 "Capitalists, Farmers, and Workers in the New Deal - The Ironies of Government Intervention." Presented at the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Foster-Carter, Aidan
1978 "The Modes of Production Controversy." New Left Review 107.

Franklin, S.H.
1969 The European Peasantry. London: Methuen.

Friedland, William H., Amy Barton, and Robert J. Thomas
1981 Manufacturing Green Gold: Capital, Labor, and Technology in the Lettuce Industry. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Friedmann, Harriet
1978a "World Market, State, and Family Farm: Social Bases of Household Production in an Era of Wage Labor." Comparative Studies in Society and History 20(4):545-86.

1978b "Simple Commodity Production and Wage Labour in the American Plains." Journal of Peasant Studies 6(1):71-100.

1980a "Household Production and the National Economy. Concepts for the Analysis of Agrarian Formations." The Journal of Peasant Studies 7(2).

1980b "Economic Analysis of the Postbellum South: Regional Economies and World Markets." Comparative Studies in Society and History 22(4):639-52.

forthcoming "The Political Economy of Food: The Rise and Fall of the Postwar International Order." American Journal of Sociology, special supplement edited by Michael Burawoy and Theda Skocpol.

Frobel, Folker, Jurgen Heinrichs, and Otto Kreye
1980 The New International Division of Labour. Cambridge: The University Press.

George, Susan
1976 How the Other Half Dies: The Real Reasons for World Hunger. Penguin.

Gerschenkron, Alexander
1943 Bread and Democracy in Germany. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hindess, Barry and Paul Q. Hirst
1975 Pre-Capitalist Modes of Production. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hintze, Otto
1975 The Historical Essays of Otto Hintze. Felix Gilbert, ed. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Hopkins, Raymond F. and Donald J. Puchala
1980 Global Food Interdependence: Challenge to American Foreign Policy. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kautsky, Karl
1899 "Summary of Selected Parts of Kautsky's The Agrarian Question." J. Banaji, trans., Economy and Society 5(1), 1976:2-49.

Kay, Cristobal
1974 "Comparative Development of the European Manorial System and the Latin American Hacienda System." The Journal of Peasant Studies 2(1):69-98.

Kula, Witold
1962 An Economic Theory of the Feudal Systems. Published in English [1976]. London: New Left Books.

Lappe, Frances Moore and Joseph Collins
1979 Food First: Beyond the Myth of Scarcity. New York: Ballantine.

Lappe, Francis Moore, Joseph Collins and David Kinley
1980 Aid As Obstacle. San Francisco: Institute for Food and Development Policy.

Laslett, Barbara
1977 "Social Change and the Family: Los Angeles, California, 1850-1870." American Sociological Review 42(2):268-91.

Laslett, Peter
1965 The World We Have Lost. London: Methuen.

Lenin, V. I.
1908 The Development of Capitalism in Russia. Moscow: Institute of Marxism-Leninism, 1957.

Levine, David
1977 Family Formations in an Age of Nascent Capitalism. New York: Academic.

Mandle, Jay R.
1978 The Roots of Black Poverty: The Southern Plantation After the Civil War. Durham: Duke University Press.

Massey, Doreen and Alejandrina Catalano
1978 Land and Capital. London: Edward Arnold.

Mayhew, Anne
1972 "A Reappraisal of the Causes of Farm Protest in the United States, 1870-1900." Journal of Economic History 30:464-75.

Meillassoux, Claude
1981 Maidens, Meal, and Money. Cambridge: The University Press.

Millar, J. R.
1970 "A Reformulation of A.V. Chayanov's Theory of the Peasant Economy." Economic Development and Cultural Change 18:219-29.

Mollard, Amedee
1978 Paysans Exploites. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.

Mooney, Patrick

n.d. "Class Relations and Class Structure in the Midwest." University of Wisconsin, M.S.

1979 "The National Farmer's Organization in Wisconsin: A History of the Early Years." MS.

Moore, Barrington

1967 Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Morishima, M. and G. Catephores

1975 "Is There an 'Historical Transformation Problem'?" The Economic Journal 85:309-28.

Murray, Robin

1978 "Value and the Theory of Rent: Capital and Class" No. 3 & 4.

Newby, Howard

1977 The Deferential Worker. London: Allen Lane.

1978 "The Rural Sociology of Advanced Capitalist Societies." In Howard Newley, ed., International Perspectives in Rural Sociology. Chicester: John Wiley & Sons.

Paige, Jeffery M.

1976 Agrarian Revolution. Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World. New York: The Free Press.

Pfeffer, Max J.

1980 "The Labor Process and Corporate Agriculture: Mexican Workers in California." The Insurgent Sociologist, Vol. X, No. 2 (Fall):25-44.

Ransom, Roger and Richard Sutch

1972 "Debt Peonage in the Cotton South After the Civil War." Journal of Economic History 32(3):643-67.

Rey, Pierre-Philippe

1973 Les alliances des classes. Paris: Maspero.

Richardson, R.J.

1981 "The Canadian Agricultural Frontier: An Approach to the Theory of Ground-Rent." Working Paper No. 25, Structural Analysis Programme, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto.

Schurmann, Franz
1974 The Logic of World Power. New York: Random House.

Schwartz, Michael
1976 Radical Protest and Social Structure: The Southern Farmers' Alliance and Cotton Tenancy, 1880-1890. New York: Academic Press.

Scott, Joan W.
1974 The Glassworkers of Carmaux. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Servolin, Claude
1972 "L'absorption de l'agriculture dans le mode de production capitaliste." In Yves Tavernier, Michel Gervais, and Claude Servolin, eds., L'univers politique des paysans dans la France contemporaine, Librairie Armand Colin and Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.

Shanin, Teodor
1972 The Awkward Class. Political Sociology of Peasantry in Developing Society, Russia 1910-25. London: Oxford University Press.

Skocpol, Theda
1979 States and Social Revolutions. Cambridge: The University Press.

Smith, Gavin
1979 "Socio-economic Differentiation and Relations of Producers in Central Peru." The Journal of Peasant Studies.

Stinchcombe, Arthur
1965 "Agricultural Enterprise and Rural Class Relations." In Neil J. Smelser (ed.), Readings on Economic Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Thompson, Edgar T.
1975 Plantation Societies, Race Relations, and the South: The Regimentation of Populations. Durham: Duke University Press.

Tilly, Charles (editor)
1975 The Formation of National States in Western Europe. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tilly, Louise A. and Joan W. Scott
1978 Women, Work and Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Wallerstein, Immanuel
1979 The Capitalist World Economy. Cambridge: The University Press.

Wolf, Eric R.
1966 Peasants. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

1969 Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper and Row.

Wright, Gavin
1978 The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY: ITS STATUS AND FUTURE AS REFLECTED IN RURAL SOCIOLOGY

by

Stan L. Albrecht*

I have defined my role as a participant in this 50th Anniversary Symposium of the Department of Rural Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison rather broadly. Our general task this second day has been to discuss the status and the future of the discipline of rural sociology. My intent will be to approach this task from the perspective of the editor of rural sociology's official journal. I recognize that one might use a variety of approaches in assessing the status of a scientific discipline. I am operating under the assumption that an examination of the publications of that discipline, particularly in the form of its major journal, is one viable approach. This approach is particularly attractive if we accept two additional assumptions -- (1) that at least a signficant portion of the best work of scientists who call themselves rural sociologists is submitted to the official journal of the discipline, and (2) that the best of this work finds its way into print.

---

*Professor of Sociology, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Anyone who has had a manuscript rejected, of course, is likely to argue with this second assumption.) If it operates effectively, our journal should be the mechanism which best indicates what rural sociologists are about, the problems they are interested in, the major topics that are attracting their research attention, the major conclusions they are reaching, and so on. My intent will then be to use this review to lead into a more detailed discussion of some major problem areas that I feel deserve the increased attention of the discipline of rural sociology in the next several years.

The Dual Nature of the Scientific Enterprise

Before looking at our journal as one "image" of our discipline, I would like to make a few general observations about this whole scientific process in which we are involved. Weber (1946:133) pointed out many years ago something we have all learned during our own days as students and faculty at universities. "(One) who feels called to scholarship has to realize clearly that the task before him has a double aspect. He must qualify not only as a scholar but also as a teacher. And the two do not at all coincide. One can be a preeminent scholar and at the same time an abominably poor teacher."

Taken this as a given, I would argue that the product of 50 years of rural sociology at Wisconsin can be found both in the research and in the teaching that have been done at this university. No great contribution can be made without both. We tend to focus primarily on the research end of the scale because it is recognized as commonplace that in order "to survive and thrive in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

scientific and academic communities one must make a contribution to the literature" (Oromaner, 1979:339).

However, research over the last couple of decades has demonstrated that relatively few scientists really contribute to the accumulation of knowledge in the form of publication. Ladd and Lipset (1975), in a study of all full-time faculty members at American universities, found that one-third have never published an article, over half have never written or edited a book while only 7 percent have had five or more books published and only 10 percent have had 20 or more articles published.

More recent work has concentrated on the post publication history of research. Oromaner (1979) has found that what is true for publication is also true for citations -- few individuals receive many citations while many individuals receive a few citations. Oromaner found that one-third of 145 articles published in American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology, and Social Forces "perished" in the sense that they received no citations in 10 of the most important sociological journals in the 10 years following their publication. Further, 60 percent of the published articles received two or fewer citations in subsequently published articles. Yet, many individuals who have not contributed significantly to the literature of the discipline have taught and trained students who have made such contributions.

The advancement of knowledge can be made both by good teachers and by good researchers and, as Robert Merton (1957:639) has noted, the primary role of the scientist is to advance knowledge:

> On every side, the scientist is reminded that it is his role to advance knowledge and his happiest fulfillment of that role, to advance knowledge greatly. This is only to say, of course, that in the institution of science originality is at a premium. For it is through originality, in greater or smaller increments, that knowledge advances. When the institution of science works efficiently, and like other social institutions, it does not always do so, recognition and esteem accrue to those who have best fulfilled their roles, to those who have made genuinely original contributions to the common stock of knowledge. Then are found those happy circumstances in which self-interest and moral obligation coincide and fuse.

In his classic statement on science as a vocation, Weber (1946:138) reinforces some of the points made later by Merton when he identifies what he sees as a fate that distinguishes scientific endeavor from art. Weber notes that a great work of art is never surpassed, never antiquated. In fact, no one will ever be able to say of a great work of art that it is outstripped by another work. In science, on the other hand,

> each of us knows that what he has accomplished will be antiquated in ten, twenty, fifty years. That is the fate to which science is subjected; it is the very meaning of scientific work, to which it is devoted in a quite specific sense, as compared with other spheres of culture for which in general the same holds. Every scientific "fulfillment" raises new "questions"; it asks to be "surpassed" and outdated. Whoever wishes to serve science has to resign himself to this fact. Scientific works certainly can last as "gratifications" because of their artistic quality, or they may remain important as means of training. Yet they will be surpassed scientifically -- let that be repeated -- for it is our common fate and, more, our common goal. We cannot work without hoping that others will advance further than we have.

That process of advancement can occur both through good research and through good teaching.

The Role of Professional Journals in the Scientific Enterprise

One reason that we focus more on research is that publication in scientific journals and related outlets is the major vehicle of communication in science and the major vehicle of advancement for the individual scientist (Rodman, 1970). Janice Beyer (1978) has expanded upon this notion by describing the dual "gatekeeper" functions of professional journals. The first gatekeeper role of the journal is to serve as the major mechanism by which scientific information, new knowledge, research findings and the latest theoretical and methodological advances are communicated to others. Brilliant theoretical syntheses or the latest methodological advances will be largely meaningless unless they are communicated to others so that they can be adopted, retested, perfected and taught to the next generation of scholars.

The second major function of scientific journals is to serve as access to channels of recognition for the individual scientist. Advancement in science comes largely through individual scientists or groups of scientists identifying problems that are of concern, determining proper methods for studying or solving these problems, and then performing experiments or otherwise testing the validity of one's ideas in the empirical world. The research is then published so that professional peers can evaluate what has been done, improve upon it, expand its application and so on. Each individual scientist has some obligation to help expand the horizons of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

knowledge in his or her field of interest. Research and publication allows this to be done. If the scientist is successful and others evaluate the contribution as significant, then it is natural that he or she gain stature in the field, be promoted, granted tenure and so on. Publication thus becomes a symbol of scientific contribution.

The importance of scientific publication is further noted by Lacy and Busch (1980:2) when they state that "an article in a reputable journal does not merely represent the opinions of its author; it bears the imprimatur of scientific authenticity, as given to it by the editor and the referees he may have consulted." The Lacy-Busch study demonstrated that professionals in the agricultural sciences view their journals as the single most important publication outlet for their research. Over 60 percent of the individual scientists who participated in their study indicated that journals were a very important resource for their research. On the other hand, fewer than 20 percent indicated the same level of importance for books, monographs, and research bulletins.

How this whole task of professional publication is accomplished is of interest to all associated with the enterprise of science. As noted by Crane (1967), Merton (1957), Rodman (1970) and many others, one of the most important norms of scientific enterprise is that scientific achievements as reflected in successful journal publication are to be judged on their merits and without reference to the social characteristics of the individual scientist -- whether these be race, sex, religion, ideological orientation, current university affiliation, university from which one's terminal degree was obtained, or whatever. And, while there has accumulated some evidence that universalistic norms were not always operating, my impressions are that access to professional rewards systems in the form of journal publication operates independently of the "non-legitimate" personal and social characteristics of the individual scientists. Some studies that have argued to the contrary simply have too many defects, in my opinion, to be considered valid. For example, while several studies have shown that significant proportions of the articles which appear in scientific journals are contributed by scientists from major universities (see Crane, 1967, for example), this does not mean that the selection criteria are operating in such a way as to favor these individuals at the expense of scholars at other than major universities. There are simply too many other factors operating including, for example, the availability of research money at major universities, released time from teaching for research, lower teaching loads, the recruitment of better-trained graduate students and new faculty and so on, all of which, I think, are more important factors than the assumed bias of journals in favoring scientists from these institutions.

A Look at Rural Sociology Through Its Journal

With this as general background, what can we say about the status of rural sociology from an examination of the journal *Rural Sociology*? Despite the "crisis" rhetoric of the past few years (see, for example, Picou, Wells, and Nyberg, 1978), it is my distinct impression that the field of rural sociology is very much alive and well, at least as reflected in the continual flow of manuscripts to the journal of Rural Sociology and in the lively and active debate that we see in a number of important sub-areas of the discipline. Rather than a reflection of crisis, I personally view the critical dialogue of Newby, Buttel and others as a sign of good health (see Newby and Buttel, 1980). Submissions to Rural Sociology have remained virtually at a constant level during the last several years, though the same cannot be said for a number of sister journals in our discipline. For example, the 1981 editor's reports for the journals published by the American Sociological Association indicate a continuing decline in the number of submissions to these journals (Footnotes, 1981). William Form notes that there was a 15 percent decline in the submissions to the ASR from 1979 to 1980. While significant, this rate is somewhat lower than the decline for the previous two years -- a 20 percent decline for the previous year and a 28 percent decline for the year before that. Submissions to the Journal for Health and Social Behavior dropped almost one-third between 1976 and 1979, though this trend reversed in 1980. Social Psychology Quarterly experienced a 23 percent decline in submissions between 1979 and 1980. I understand that submissions to the American Journal of Sociology have dropped even more dramatically and that this pattern has affected not just our professional journals. Jim Zuiches has told me that research proposal submissions to the National Science Foundation are way down from patterns during previous years.

In their brief review of the status of the discipline in 1967, Haller and Borgatta (1968) responded to the question of whether there should even be a rural sociology at all since (1) "real" sociologists can do whatever it is that rural sociologists do anyway without being labeled, and (2) the proportion of farmers in the population is decreasing. My response to this is that while "real" sociologists may be able to do what rural sociologists do without being so labeled, the important work that is being done by rural sociologists would probably not be done if there wasn't a subdiscipline which focused specifically on doing this work. The very training of rural sociologists points them toward a set of problems and research issues that otherwise might go unattended and this, I feel, is one of the most important functions of the discipline. There is, as Glenn Fuguitt noted several years ago, a continued need for sociological research conducted in a rural setting (Fuguitt, 1963). The continued viability of the task, I think is reflected in the continued viability of the journal.

In 1965 William Sewell (1965) published a rather detailed examination of the types of research being done by rural sociologists. Sewell's analysis was based on an examination of articles published in Rural Sociology between 1936 and 1965. Sewell's review was updated by Stokes and Miller (1975) a decade later to determine any changes in trends in areas of interest during the 10 years following the completion of the earlier study.

In order to develop some idea of the current state of the discipline of rural sociology as determined by what rural sociologists do, I have developed a very preliminary comparison with these two earlier studies using a rather different data base. Both of these studies examine articles published in Rural Sociology. I will look at articles submitted to Rural Sociology during my editorship. The points of comparison are obviously very different. Nevertheless, it can be argued that what is submitted might very well be a better indicator of what rural sociologists are doing than just what is published. Critics might argue, for example, that the latter is more a reflection of the gatekeeping role of the editor and editorial referees than a true reflection of what rural sociologists actually do.

While recognizing differences in point of comparison, the major purpose of my brief review was to identify any important changes that might have occurred since 1975 in the types of problems that rural sociologists are examining.

The data are very interesting. In the four decades between 1936 and 1974, between 29 and 35 percent of all articles published in the journal were classified as dealing with social organization. Significantly fewer (21 percent) of the articles reviewed during my editorship can be so classified. As was true for earlier decades, the most popular topic under this general heading was the broad category of community. Very few manuscripts during my editorship have dealt with the institutions of the family, education and religion. More have dealt with the politcal institution and with questions of power and decision-making than during earlier periods.

For the four decade period, between 2 and 15 percent of all published articles dealt with the broad topic of social change. During my editorship, 10 percent of all submissions fell into this category. Most of these deal with adoption-diffusion. In fact, diffusion was the sixth most popular topic overall.

Social psychological submissions were approximately at the average for the four decade period making up 13 percent of all submissions. However, the number of articles dealing with population was somewhat higher than for any previous period. As would be expected, a large percentage of these dealt with the population turnaround that was observed during the past decade. It is perhaps interesting to note that a relatively high percentage of submissions in this category were published -- higher than was the case in most other areas. The number of submissions in the areas of social welfare and policy was quite comparable to the means for the four decades. The number of methodological submissions was significantly lower.

However -- and this is the point I would like to stress -- there were some other obvious changes in patterns evident in the submissions. Fully one-fifth of all submissions during my editorship fell into four rather specific topic areas that are not clearly identifiable in the set of broad categories used by Sewell and Stokes and Miller. These four areas are: (1) energy and environment; (2) the structure of agriculture, including issues of small farms, appropriate technology, and so on; (3) women's roles; and (4) patterns of rural deviance. In fact, energy and environment and women's roles were the third and fourth most popular areas in terms of number of papers submitted for review, following only the topics of community and migration.

I would argue that these very preliminary observations indicate that in some ways we are plowing new ground, particularly in some areas that have very important policy implications. In his 1972 presidential address, Jim Copp (1972:521) expressed disappointment at the tendency of rural sociologists to continue to plow old ground and to pursue the same old problems rather than confront major new problems that are emerging in our society. Among the problems he felt deserved additional attention were the following: (1) the social ecology of rural areas; (2) social aspects of economic location; (3) patterns of influence, leadership, and decision-making processes; (4) the changing structure of agriculture; (5) the quality of life under different degrees of population concentration; (6) the social consequences of migration for the migrant, the community of destination and the community of origin; and (7) rural development and the quality of the environment. It can be noted that several of the most popular research areas as reflected in submissions to the journal coincide with Copp's identification of problems that have greater policy relevance and applied importance.

Similarly, Warner (1974) in his presidential address given two years later, identified three problems that portend major consequences for rural society now and in years ahead: (1) the food supply problem, (2) the energy problem, and (3) the land use problem. Many of the papers submitted for review to the journal clearly fall under one or more of these broad headings. We do, in other words, seem to be responding to important concerns and relevant issues.

A Major Problem Set for the Future: The Impacts of Energy Development and Controversial Technologies on Small Rural Communities

As indicated from my review of submissions to Rural Sociology over the past three years, one area that has attracted increasing attention is that of the impacts of rapid industrialization, particularly in the form of energy development, on small rural communities. When we combine the problems associated with energy development with those associated with what I call controversial technologies (large-scale military defense systems and nuclear waste repositories) we see an area where rural sociology has some major contributions to make. It is to a discussion of these that I would like to turn for the next few minutes.

In recent years we have observed a dramatic growth in interest in environmental sociology among rural sociologists as well as among other social scientists generally. It has been argued that the environment was "discovered" as a social problem by the social science community in the later 1960s. The events that led to the emergence of the environment as a social problem are many-fold, but several of the most important are captured in the following quote from Munson (1980:IX):

> . . . concern for the environment was to most Americans of only trifling importance during the first half of the Twentieth Century. Their heads

> had been turned by unprecedented prosperity and the promise of technological wonders. Around 1970, however, seemingly unrelated events undermined this conventional wisdom. In 1969 an oil spill damaged the ocean and paved the beaches around Santa Barabara with tar. Lake Erie was declared dead, the Cuyahoga River -- filled with pollutants -- caught fire, and the Club of Rome's computer calculated that our exponential growth in consumption was depleting our resources.

We should recognize that the study of human-environment relationships had, of course, attracted the attention of rural sociologists, human ecologists and various others for many years but the "environmental crisis" of the 1960s dramatically increased the amount of attention given this topic. A major reason for this is that all of the issues discussed in the environmental crisis rhetoric are, at root, social problems. As Heilbroner (1974:61) has noted, "all dangers. . .population, growth, war, environmental damage, scientific technology -- are social problems, originated in human behavior and capable of amelioration by alteration of that behavior."

What, specifically, then, is the role of the rural sociologist in this area? There are a number of ways of answering this question. Let me focus for the next several minutes on just one.

Dunlap and Catton (1979a; 1979b; Catton, 1976), in their detailed and insightful work on human society-ecosystem relationships, have argued that contemporary industrial society is faced with the critical problem of the simultaneous closing of the twin jaws of a very important vise. These twin jaws are resource depletion and pollution. We are all familiar with the large literature dealing with problems that industrialized societies face because of the depletion of non-renewable resources. Some of these arguments have suffered somewhat of a set-back with the recent discovery of larger-than-anticipated reserves of such important resources as natural gas and petroleum. Nevertheless, the very non-renewable nature of these resources means that their availability is potentially problematic sometime in the future. We are also all familiar with the equally large literature on the problems associated with the pollution of our air, our water, our land from the over-use of chemical fertilizers, and so on. One of the outcomes of the projected closing of these two jaws that is of tremendous importance to rural sociologists is found in population growth and distribution patterns in the western portion of the United States. (Other outcomes, of course, are reflected in our growing literature in rural sociology on alternative technologies, the viability of small farms, and organic farming). The interest in finding new resources, in substituting coal for oil, in developing synthetic fuels from coal, oil shale and agricultural products, combined with the tendency toward the increasingly remote siting of plants due to increasingly restrictive environmental laws and regulatory siting criteria has dramatically changed patterns of population distribution in the west and has created a whole new laboratory for research for the rural sociologist interested in such diverse issues as rural industrializaton, population turnarounds, community change, public service delivery systems, community mobilization and decision making, and so on.

My point is that I feel that there is a critical need to continue to apply what we have learned as rural sociologists to these rather dramatic changes that are occurring in rural communities in the northern plains and the West as a result of very large-scale energy development over the next few years. As noted, the problems associated with energy development are compounded in a number of areas of the West by the potential introduction of the massive MX missile system and the possible introduction of a number of other controversial technologies in the form of nuclear waste repositories.

We do have a large literature, much of it coming from the University of Wisconsin, dealing with rural industrialization, population turnarounds and related issues. Rural sociologists here and elsewhere have been studying these processes for years and have documented some of their important consequences for rural communities and their residents. At the same time, however, we must recognize that much of what is happening or projected to happen in the northern plains and western states is quite unlike what has happened in the typical midwestern community that has successfully attracted a new industrial plant. For example, the magnitude and rate of growth are usually much greater than what we have experienced in much of our literature on rural industrialization. In addition, the growth is occurring in areas that are often much more isolated geographically than is true of the typical community of the Midwest.

In a recent paper (Albrecht, 1980), I have expanded on these ideas by arguing that the critical variables in predicting the magnitude of social impacts that will be asociated with large-scale energy development or related projects fall into two major categories: (1) the characteristics of the existing community or communities at or near the proposed site, and (2) the characteristics of the incoming labor force. Others have argued (see, for example, Murdock and Leistritz, 1979; Wilkinson, 1981) that other project-related characteristics in addition to the characteristics of the incoming labor force are important. These include such things as plant location relative to the communities, project scale, timing, organizational characteristics and the interactional patterns that develop between a project and a community.

Size. In general, it is safe to say that the smaller the community prior to impact, the greater the impact and the larger the problem associated with meeting service delivery needs (Krannich, 1981). The western part of the United States contains many areas that are sparsely populated with numerous small, widely-scattered communities, none of which are likely to have a labor force that is large enough or with the skills that are necessary for a large-scale project such as the construction of a coal-burning power generation facility, a large surface mining operation or a major modern military defense system. Consequently, meeting labor force needs often means importing a large number of outsiders. (For well-developed discussions of local/nonlocal hiring patterns on energy-related projects, see Mountain West, 1975, 1977; Thompson, et al., 1978; Denver Research Institution, 1979; and Murdock and

Leistritz, 1979). When there is an importation of large numbers of outsiders, long-time residents see their community change almost overnight and they are virtually powerless to do anything about it. Cortese and Jones (1977:86) have put it succinctly: "The long-timer in a boom town wakes up one morning in his own bed, but in a different town."

Demographic history. The demographic history of a community frequently interacts with size but can also be important independently from it. Many of these areas facing rapid growth exhibit smaller populations in 1980 than they had in 1970 and even earlier. Thus, they are declining communities with older populations. The proposed development will reverse these historical trends quickly and dramatically. Communities that have experienced decline and stagnation for decades are little prepared for boom-type growth. Social institutions in these communities are neither prepared, nor in some instances, capable of becoming prepared, for rapid growth. As a consequence, they do not adjust readily to the changes they confront.

Social and cultural homogeneity. A third factor is that most of the rural areas of the West are characterized by the high degree of social and cultural homogeneity. In large part, these are small ranching and farming communities. Their inhabitants exhibit life-styles that differ in many important ways from what one expects in larger, heterogeneous, urban communities. As a consequence, the values and interests of the people involved differ from those of the newcomers who are attracted to the area for employment. The latter

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tend to be much younger, are more likely to be single, have few attachments to the local community except as a place of employment, and prefer different types of leisure time activities. (For more detailed discussion of the importance of these factors, see Mountain West, 1975, 1977; Wieland, et al., 1977, 1979; and Murdock and Leistritz, 1980).

Degree of social and geographic isolation. Early sociologists in the West have often spoken of the social costs of space (see Kraenzel, 1955). This referred to the fact that because of their geographic isolation, workers cannot live in or commute from larger communities which could more readily absorb them. Instead, they must establish residence, even though often of a temporary nature, in the local communities. If an area is less isolated, then the impacts will be far less noticeable because a much larger proportion of the construction work force will be able to commute (Krannich, 1981).

Range, mix, and quality of existing infrastructure. Rural communities that stand to be impacted by energy development tend to be behind already in terms of their ability to provide necessary services to their population. For example, Gilmore and Duff (1974) have noted that whereas the doctor/population ratio in the state of Wyoming was about 1:1,100, it was only 1:1,800 in Sweetwater County even prior to the boom growth of that county. In the four years between 1970 and 1974, this ratio declined to 1:3,700. Rock (1976) has argued that virtually no town or county revenue system can cope with boom growth, "much less the small towns of the arid and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

semi-arid West, where the revenue-cost balance is as tenuous and fragile as the eco-system." In large part, then, we are dealing with communities that are already somewhat marginal in terms of their ability to provide services and certainly not geared-up to cope with the magnitude and rapidity of the change they confront. Most do not have the planning personnel and capabilities that will keep them from being overwhelmed when the boom comes.

In addition to community characteristics, the nature of the incoming labor force also has important implications in determining impacts. As noted above, in many areas almost all of the workers required for the construction of power plants, for the strip-mining of coal or for any of a number of other types of energy-related projects will of necessity be imported. Among the more important characteristics of these immigrants in terms of their impacts on the local community are the following.

Size, permanence and rate of growth. Most communities have the ability to adjust to growth as long as that growth is not too great and occurs at a manageable pace. However, the growth that is already occurring or is projected to occur in many rural communities of the West does not have these characteristics. Crawford (1976: 1) cites a FEA Task Force Report which argues that "boom-type growth exists above a threshold in the 7 percent to 10 percent range. After growth rates exceed 10 percent, existing institutions become inadequate or break down." One of the primary factors that distinguishes contemporary energy-related boom towns from earlier boom towns in the West is the rapidity and scale of population

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

growth (Cortese & Jones, 1977: 77). Communities are now doubling or tripling their populations in two to four years. Even the best-prepared communities are unable to deal with growth of this magnitude.

This problem is made even more difficult because reliable data with which the community could begin to prepare is often unavailable. "Community planning for energy development depends on reliable projections of the magnitude, demographic composition, and distribution of the population growth than can be expected from the construction and operation of development facilities" (Crawford, 1976: 2). However, such information is frequently unavailable to the impact communities. To quote from Crawford:

> Nearly every proposed energy development project in the West is plagued by starts and stops, changes in plans and erroneous estimates of size, impact, timing, and cost....Much of the uncertainty stems from an irresolute national energy policy, difficulties in obtaining forthright and accurate information from the energy industries, actual and threatened litigation, and EIS and other regulatory problems.

Another major problem is the temporary nature of the growth that occurs. Since many of the projects involve the construction of large-scale power generation facilities, the major impacts will occur during a four-to-eight-year period when large numbers of temporary laborers are imported. The permanent operating force tends to be much smaller. Thus, in many of the projects, a bust is built into the boom. The problem this creates for local communities has been identified by Cummings and Mehr (1977: 266) as follows:

> Does the municipality attempt to meet infrastructure demands of the peak population, which then implies the possible existence of substantial idle capacity at the end of the construction phase, or does one plan for levels of urban infrastructure for the long run stable population, which may imply a substantial deterioration in the quality and/or availability of infrastructure-related services during the construction period?

Clearly, this is not an easy question to answer and it is compounded by the fiscal problems which often inhibit the community from making either choice.

Social, cultural, and demographic characteristics of the labor force. As the degree to which the workers imported for a particular energy-related project differ from the long-time inhabitants of the area increases, the consequent social and cultural impacts they will have on the area will also increase. Further, because of the social and cultural homogeneity of many of the impact areas noted above, the probability that the in-migrating labor force will differ in significant ways is much greater.

Again, this problem is magnified by the fact that while long-time residents share in the costs of growth, many of them do not share in its benefits. Persons not in the work force or unemployed do not share the higher earnings that are inevitably associated with a large construction project. In addition, relatively immobile workers who are employed in sectors where earnings do not grow rapidly gain little from the new project. All of these are likely to be more characteristic of the old-timers than of the newcomers. In addition, all original residents bear the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

burdens of higher taxes and potential reductions in the quality of existing services created by crowding and competition. This raises the difficult but critical problem of equitable cost-sharing. Significant costs are often imposed on long-time residents of the impact communities because they do not exhibit the demographic and related characteristics that would allow them to participate in the benefits that accrue from the project. Further, the costs they incur are not taken into account under existing rules for making social decisions.

Project location relative to communities. There are a number of factors that are important to consider growing out of decisions of project location relative to communities. For example, project location can significantly influence local patterns of influence and decision-making. If a project results in significant growth of a particular community relative to other communities in the vicinity or county, important shifts in political power and influence can occur. Murdock (1981) notes that to the extent that changes in population distribution change patterns of dominance between local communities, the following important patterns have been noted in the literature:

(1) Newly dominant communities will gain a disproportionate share of the positive economic impacts of the new development (Hassinger, 1978).

(2) Newly dominant communities will be able to obtain a larger proportion of future growth (Johansen and Fuguitt, 1979).

(3) Newly dominant communities will show greater diversification

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in their economies over time and will be more resilient in adapting to new problems and opportunities.

All of this indicates that there will be major long-term effects that grow out of location decisions in addition to the more immediate short-term effects that are associated with the in-migration of construction workers and permanent operation workers.

Along with changes in patterns of community dominance, other important issues grow out of project-location decisions. For example, population movement into a local area is especially problematic when it does not coincide with fiscal and other jurisdictional boundaries (Murdock, 1981). When a project is built on one side of a county line while most of the population settle on another, the tax base goes to one jurisdiction while the impacts go to another. New political and other jurisdictional mechanisms are required if such problems are to be solved.

Project scale, timing, and organizational characteristics. Important issues of project scale have already been noted: the larger the project, the larger the number of workers likely to be required. And, assuming that the project will be located in a relatively small, rural community of the West, this implies a larger number of primary and secondary workers that will have to be imported.

Timing is also critical. For example, when there are multiple projects proposed for a given geographical area (as is often the case for energy development projects in the Rocky Mountain and Northern Plains states), carefully coordinated decisions on project

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

timing can help communities avoid a series of boom-bust cycles. On the other hand, projects that directly overlap can result in competition for basically the same labor force and can increase the potentially deleterious consequences of very rapid growth followed by almost equally rapid population decline.

The degree of "fit" between a project and a community is also important. Wilkinson (1981) notes that previous research on social change generally supports the proposition that the social effects of an energy development project of any given type and scale will increase with the degree to which it is inconsistent with existing characteristics of the community.

Interactional patterns between project and community. Finally, the pattern of interaction that develops between a community and a project becomes critical in determining the nature of social impacts that a project will have on a community. It is interesting to note that a number of formal procedures have developed in recent years to more clearly define the interface between industry and community. For example, the Wyoming Industrial Siting Act requires industry to work closely with communities in identifying potential social impacts and in developing programs for mitigating these impacts -- including the amount of funds that the company will be required to contribute to the mitigation effect. The state of Utah has recently passed an impact alleviation law with some of the same characteristics.

With this as a brief overview of some of the important variables that we as rural sociologists will need to examine in considering

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

some of the major of the industrialization of the rural West, let me now turn to an example. Specifically, I would like to comment on some of the potential community impacts that are likely to be associated with the proposed deployment of the massive MX missile system in the Great Basin area of Utah and Nevada. The area where the MX would be based is, in many ways, typical of other rural counties in the West. Communities are small, they are geographically isolated, they tend to be highly homogeneous in terms of the religious and cultural backgrounds of their inhabitants, most have experienced several years of outmigration of younger segments of the population, and so on.

The rationale for the development of the MX system is that the Soviet Union is now in the process of acquiring, through increases in the accuracy and strength of its new generation of missiles, the capability of destroying the United States's land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles in their silos. The Department of Defense estimates that this capability will be substantial by the early 1980s. Defense spokesmen also argue that the foremost purpose of the U.S. strategic forces is to deter a Soviet attack. Thus, the United States relies primarily on a counter-threat. That is, if the Soviet Union were to attack first and with sufficient force to destroy the United States, the United States would, in turn, be able to retaliate with sufficient force to destroy the Soviet Union. The strategy of deterrence depends not on how many bombs and missiles the United States has at a given point in time, but, rather, on how many would still be functional following a Soviet attack. If the new Soviet missiles, can, indeed, destroy the U.S. land-based ICBM system in its silos, then this would decrease the ability of the U.S. to respond in kind to a Soviet nuclear attack and would decrease our ability to deter a Soviet first attack.

The MX proposal is designed to introduce the critical ingredient of location uncertainty into the land-based ICBM force so that the new Soviet weapons, despite their increase in strength and accuracy, could not be expected to destroy more than a fraction of the U.S. land-based missiles. This could guarantee a counter-attack of sufficient force that the consequences for the Soviets would be serious enough that they would be deterred from a first attack.

The MX would be a new missile, more than twice the size of the Minuteman III which is currently the most modern U.S. missile aimed at the Soviet Union. It would be 71 feet long, 92 inches in diameter, and would weigh 192,000 pounds. It would be equipped with 10 separate nuclear warheads, each independently targetable. Each of these 10 high-powered warheads would be about twice as accurate as the Minuteman which carries a maximum payload of three nuclear warheads.

The Carter administration proposed to deploy 200 of these new missiles among 4,600 multiple protective structures (MPS). That is, each of the 200 missiles would have 23 separate protective structures from which it could be launched. The MPS sites would be of sufficient hardness and spacing that no Soviet warhead could destroy more than one site. Since the locations of the missiles among the 23 potential launch sites would be unknown to the attacker, he would have to destroy substantially all of them to ensure that he had eliminated the United State's land-based missile force. For example, an attacker that succeeded in destroying three-quarters of the MPS sites would still leave one quarter of the MX missiles intact. Since each of these remaining missiles would carry 10 independently targetable warheads, the 50 surviving missiles would leave the U.S. with a 500 warhead second strike ICBM force.

A brief glance by an outsider at preliminary siting maps for the MX is not likely to result in immediate familiarity with the communities likely to be most heavily impacted by MX. In Utah, communities nearest the sites include Minersville, Milford, Beryl and Hinkley. In Nevada, they are Pioche, Tonopah, McGill, Ruth and Ely. These relatively tiny communities are located in a sea of federally-owned land. In fact, more than 90 percent of the 31,000 square-mile area where the Air Force would build the MX system is owned by the federal government.

The area is sparsely populated and none of the communities are at all prepared to inherit a large population influx. Delta is the largest community on the Utah side that is near one of the proposed bases and its population is only about 2,000. Nevada impact areas are likewise characterized by small, rural communities. In addition to smallness, the population of the area exhibits other characteristics that imply even more significant impacts than would be the case in an area having rather different characteristics. For example, because of a long history of outmigration resulting from the inability of agriculture to meet the employment and income needs of the local population, residents tend to be older than is true for the two states generally. Relatively few have the necessary skills and experience that would allow them to obtain upgraded employment as construction workers on the project.

The present population of the area, particularly on the Utah side of the border, is remarkably homogeneous and stable. For example, more than half of the residents of Millard County in Utah shave lived there for 40 years or more. In a society that has been characterized by high levels of population mobility, this is a rather unusual statistic. The high level of social and cultural homogeneity of the area is reflected in the effect that over 90 percent of all residents in the four impact counties are members of the Mormon Church. Nevada communities are more diverse religiously but are quite homogeneous in other ways.

Initial Air Force estimates indicated that approximately 28,000 construction workers would be required for the MX project. This would mean that at the height of construction, MX would require about as many construction workers as the number of people who now live in the immediate MX area. Estimates of permanent population impacts indicate that the number of people now living in the area would triple as a result of the MX project. If 28,000 construction workers were required, estimates are that in 1986-1987 (the peak period) there would be 105,000 newcomers in the area. Recent research on boomtown growth in energy impacted communities in the Rocky Mountain area has demonstrated some of the negative socio-economic impacts of rapid growth in small, isolated rural areas. However, none of the boomtown studies have dealt with a rate and magnitude of growth that even approximates that which would occur with the MX.

The potential population impacts of the MX are particularly compounded by the fact that the Utah portion of the system will be located in the same general area as the Intermountain Power Project. IPP will be the largest coal-burning power generation facility ever constructed. This project is scheduled to commence in 1982 and peak in 1985-1986, which is the same time that construction of the MX system will be in full swing. Consequently, the impacts of the two projects will occur on top of each other. Other projects planned for the area include electric power generation (Warner Valley Project in Utah and Harry Allen project in Nevada), extensive mineral mining and oil and gas exploration, coal mining and expanded manufacturing.

The need for careful sociological assessment of what is going to happen cannot be denied. The fact that such an assessment has not been done to this point is reflected in the fact that the expensive Air Force Draft Environmental Statement on the MX devotes over five times as many pages to the study of impacts the missile system will have on the pronghorn antelope as it does to the study of impacts on human communities and quality of life. It is little wonder that a local resident recently commented to me that residents of Delta, Utah, have been "looking around the area for endangered fish or an endangered species of some sort so that we could get someone to listen to us. Obviously, they don't care about people."

A project like MX, with its massive impacts on rural communities, provides a large number of problems for the rural sociologist. Many of these are "mainstream" issues in the discipline, including (1) the contribution of projects like this to the migration turnaround and the consequences of this migration turnaround both for the newcomers and for the areas that receive the new migrants; (2) problems associated with public service delivery in rural communities that are virtually overwhelmed by both the rate and the magnitude of the growth that occurs; (3) the impacts of growth on things like community cohesion and integration, particularly in areas that have been highly homogeneous; and (4) the impacts of rapid growth on community social structure, including patterns of differentiation and stratification.

There are other issues that have perhaps been less "mainstream" that must also be examined. One of the most important of these is the question of the distribution of impacts across population groups and geographic boundaries. It is somewhat paradoxical that the environmental sociology literature indicates that the least interest and concern about environmental issues is expressed by those groups who should be most concerned. As Schnaiberg (1971) has argued:

> If we turn to cost of environmental degradation, the following appears to be an accurate statement: regardless of the particular cost dimension examined, environmental costs to the individual are consistently higher for the poor than for the more affluent. Whether in terms of air pollution (higher in central city areas, where high concentrations of poor reside), water pollution (more severe in high density areas,

> again where the poor reside) or land pollution (impact of DDT spraying is most severe for migrant laborers, for example), the poor are in a position of entrapment. . .and if we project current environmental decay to the apocalypse that many forecast, one would have to be incredibly naive to believe that such a catastrophe would strike uniformly across social lines. If air deteriorates, oxygen is available to the more affluent; if water deteriorates, water purifiers or bottled water will go to the highest bidders; and the choicest land already belongs to the corporate elite!

However, perhaps this finding is somewhat less paradoxical when we consider that the burden of environmental improvement is also likely to be borne most heavily by the poor. A recent Ford Foundation Energy Report estimates that the poorest groups in the United States, in terms of average incomes, spend approximately 15 percent of their income on electricity, natural gas, and gasoline. This figure drops to 7 and 6 percent for the two middle income groups, and to 4 percent for the highest income group. Rate increases for these important fuels, then, have a far more severe impact on the poor than they do for higher income groups. The pollution abatement industry in this country has become very sophisticated and very expensive. When utility companies are required to spend large sums for pollution abatement (for example, to put wet scrubbers in the smoke stacks of coal-burning power generation facilities), the costs are then passed through to the consumer of the product in the form of rate increases. Obviously, then, the poor pay a disproportional share of these increased costs.

There are some direct parallels here with what is happening in rural communities of the West and northern plains. Decisions that affect the very life of these communities are being made elsewhere, either in the boardrooms of major energy corporations, in state capitals, or in the federal agencies in Washington, D.C. The benefits that are associated with the exploitation of local resources are often being borne locally. With controversial technologies like nuclear waste repository siting and large military defense systems, the social costs are focused largely on small, highly localized groups while the benefits are assumed to be national and even international in scope. At present we have no real mechanism for compensating individuals and communities for being involuntarily placed at risk due to decisions to locate a power plant, a nuclear waste repository, or an MX missile system.

Much needs to be done. Some of us have argued for several years that the basic problem with the social impact assessment literature is that it has developed largely in ignorance of the literature of rural sociology, particularly that dealing with rural industrialization and community change. We have the opportunity to make that link and, in the process, to do the very thing that both Weber and Merton defined as the primary task for the scientist -- to continue to advance the state of knowledge in our discipline.

References

Albrecht, Stan L.
1980 "Socio-Cultural Factors." In Mohan K. Wali (Ed.), Mining Ecology. London: Academic Press.

Beyer, Janice M.
1978 "Editorial Policies and Practices Among Leading Journals in Four Scientific Fields." The Sociological Quarterly 19 (Winter): 68-88.

Catton, Jr., William R.
1976 "Why the Future Isn't What It Used To Be (And How It Could Be Made Worse Than It Has To Be)." Social Science Quarterly 57 2 (September): 276-291.

Copp, James H.
1972 "Rural Sociology and Rural Development." Rural Sociology 37 (December): 5-35.

Cortese, C.F. and B. Jones
1977 "The Sociological Analysis of Boomtowns." Western Sociological Review 8: 76-90.

Crane, Diana
1967 "The Gatekeepers of Science: Some Factors Affecting The Selection of Articles for Scientific Journals." The American Sociologist 2 (November): 195-201 .

Crawford, A.B.
1976 "Socio-economic Problems Facing Boom Towns." Paper presented at NADO Conference on Socio-economic Problems in Boom Towns, Snowbird, Utah, July 25-29.

Cummings, R.G. and A.F. Mehr
1977 "Investments for Urban Infrastructure in Boomtowns." Natural Resources Journal 17: 223-240.

Denver Research Institute
1979 "Socioeconomic Impacts of Western Energy Resource Development." Washington, D. C. : Council on Environmental Quality.

Dunlap, Riley E. and William R. Catton, Jr.
1979a "Environmental Sociology." Annual Review of Sociology 5: 243-273.

1979b "Environmental Sociology: A Framework for Analysis." In T. O'Riordan and R.C. d'Arge (eds.) Progress in Resource Management and Environmental Planning, vol. 1. Chichester, England: John Wiley: 57-85.

Footnotes
1981 "1981 Editor's Reports." Footnotes (March): 14-15.

Fuguitt, Glenn V.
1963 "The City and The Countryside." Rural Sociology 28 (September): 246-261.

Gilmore, J.S. and M.K. Duff
1974 The Sweetwater County Boom: A Challenge to Growth Management. Denver Research Institute: Denver, Colorado.

Haller, Archibald O. and Edgar F. Borgatta
1968 "Rural Sociology in 1967." The American Sociologist 3 (November): 289-290.

Hassinger, Edward W.
1978 The Rural Component of American Society. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Heilbroner, R.L.
1974 An Inquiry into the Human Prospect. New York: Norton.

Johansen, Harley E. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1979 "Population Growth and Retail Decline: Conflicting Effects of Urban Accessibility in American Villages." Rural Sociology 44 (Spring): 24-38.

Kraenzel, Carl F.
1955 The Great Plains in Transition. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Krannich, Richard S.
1981 "Socioeconomic Impacts of Power Plant Developments on Nonmetropolitan Communities: An Analysis of Perceptions and Hypothesized Impact Determinants in the Eastern United States." Rural Sociology 46 (Spring): 128-142.

Lacy, William B. and Lawrence Busch
1980 "Guardians of Science: Editors' Criteria for Journal Publication in the Agricultural Sciences." Paper presented at the meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Ithaca, New York, August.

Ladd, E.C., Jr. and S.M. Lipset
1975 "Spend Their Time: The 1975 Ladd-Lipset Survey of U.S. Faculty Members." The Chronicle of Higher Education 11 (October, 14):2.

Merton, Robert K.
1957 "Priorities in Scientific Discovery: A Chapter in the Sociology of Science." American Sociological Review 22: 635-659.

Mountain West Research, Inc.
1975 Construction Worker Profile. Washington, D.C.: V.H. Winston & Sons.

1977 Bureau of Reclamation Construction Worker Survey. Denver, Colorado: Bureau of Reclamation.

Munson, Richard
1980 "Forward." In Kathleen Courrier (ed.), Life After '80: Environmental Choices We Can Live With. Andover, Massachusetts. Brick House Publishing Company, p. IX.

Murdock, Steve H.
1981 "Population and Demography." In Kristi Branch and James Thompson, BLM Social Effects Project Abridged Literature Review. Billings, Montana: Mountain West Research, pp. 106-137.

Murdock, Steve H. and F. Larry Leistritz
1979 Energy Development in the Western United States: Impact on Rural Areas. New York: Praeger.

1980 "Migration and Energy Development: Consequences for Western Communities: New Directions in Urban-Rural Migration." David L. Brown and John M. Wardwell, (eds.). New York: Academic Press.

Newby, Howard and Frederick H. Buttel
1980 "Toward a Critical Rural Sociology." In F.H. Buttel and H. Newby (eds.). The Rural Sociology of Advanced Societies: Critical Perspectives. Montclair, N.J.: Allanheld, Osmun, pp. 1-35.

Oromaner, Mark
1979 "When Publications Perish." Scholarly Publishing (July): 339-344.

Picou, J. Steven, Richard W. Wells, and Kenneth L. Nyberg
1978 "Paradigms, Theories, and Methods in Contemporary Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 43 (Winter): 559-583.

Rock, James M.
1976 "Boomtowns in the Energy-Rich West: Who Makes the Decisions, Who Bears the Costs." Intellect 105 (December): 155-158.

Rodman, Hyman
1970 "The Moral Responsibility of Journal Editors and Referees." The American Sociologist 5 (November): 351-357.

Schnaiberg, Allan
1971 "Politics, Participation and Pollution: The 'Environmental Movement.'" Mimeographed, Northwestern University.

Sewell, William H.
1965 "Rural Sociological Research, 1936-1965." Rural Sociology 30 (December): 428-451.

Stokes, C. Shannon and Michael K. Miller
1975 "A Methodological Review of Research in Rural Sociology Since 1965." Rural Sociology 40 (Winter): 411-434.

Thompson, James G., A.L. Blevins, and G.L. Watts
1978 Socio-economic Longitudinal Monitoring Report. Washington, D.C.: Old West Regional Commission.

Warner, W. Keith
1974 "Rural Society in a Post-Industrial Age." Rural Sociology 39 (Fall): 306-318.

Weber, Max
1946 "Science as a Vocation." In H.H. Gerth and D.W. Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 129-156.

Weiland, James G., F. Larry Leistritz, and Steve H. Murdock
1977 Characteristics and Settlement Patterns of Energy Related Operation Workers in the Northern Great Plains. Agricultural Economics Report 123. Fargo, N.D.: North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station.

1979 "Characteristics and Residential Patterns of Energy Related Work Forces in the Northern Great Plains." Western Journal of Agricultural Economics 4 (1): 57-68.

Wilkinson, Kenneth P.
1981 "Social Organizations." In Kristi Branch and James Thompson, Social Effects Project Abridged Literature Review. Billings, Montana: Mountain West Research, pp. 8-39.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

by

William L. Flinn*

Introduction

At the beginning of World War II, the Departments of State and Agriculture took steps to obtain a better knowledge of rural Latin America -- albeit for U.S. security reasons (Nelson, 1969). The classic rural sociological studies of T. Lynn Smith, Olen E. Leonard, Carl C. Taylor, Charles P. Loomis, Nathan L. Whitten, George W. Hill and Lowry Nelson set the tone for subsequent research in the discipline and established a particular view of the role of rural sociologists by the consumers of their research. To paraphrase Sewell (1950), rural sociologists have tended to become unwitting "handmaidens to professional educators, economists, agricultural program administrators and social actionists of all kinds" and, I would add, to international development agencies.

It is with trepidation that I peer at the private troubles and

---

*Professor of Rural Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. The author wishes to express appreciation to Frederick H. Buttel for his intellecutal assistance and comments and to John Bielefeldt for his editorial assistance. Parts of this paper appear in the author's Presidential Address to the Rural Sociology Society, Guelph, Canada, 1981.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

public issues of international rural sociology. It may seem presumptuous to think that I can say anything that hasn't been said many times before, but I want to argue that the rural sociology of economic change is entering a new era, and that the problems facing rural sociology in the next decade will be different from those diagnosed in earlier decades.

I believe that rural sociology in the international arena in the next few years can best be characterized in terms of great promise but high risk and uncertainty. On one hand, it seems apparent from the past several meetings of the Rural Sociological Society that the "internationalists" are exploring innovative approaches to crucial sociopolitical questions. There is a growing self-confidence that we are doing important things and doing them well. In contrast to the early 1960s -- when there was widespread feeling that the urbanization of North America would banish rural sociologists to the "primitive," "preliterate," "backward," "underdeveloped" or "emerging" nations in a struggle to find new meaning for diffusionist, status attainment and community development theories in an overseas setting -- the 1980s have found a domestic renaissance of public interest in rural North America and an almost insatiable appetite for analysis of international rural social issues.

Among the estimated 700 to 800 destitute millions in the world, mass poverty remains an overwhelmingly rural affliction. The poor in India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Indonesia and nearly all of Africa are still, to the extent of 70 percent or more of the total population, in the rural villages (Brandt, 1980:50). Usually half or more of the total product of these countries comes from agriculture and development strategies, and they have normally pushed for higher agricultural productivity and the fastest possible economic growth. In the 1970s, however, it was recognized that economic growth alone would not reduce absolute poverty at an acceptable speed. Many new issues with a sociological theme appeared -- basic needs, farming systems, integrated rural development, income inequalities and institutional reform. There is a growing sense that rural sociology will be extremely useful in the development of the Third World. And as simplistic technological schemes for the development of Third World countries continue to meet frequent failure (see, for example, Griffin, 1974; Dahlberg, 1979; Pearse, 1980), there seems to be a parallel surge of demand for rural sociological expertise on the international level. In sum, the 1980s promise to be a bright time for rural sociology in international development; important and intellectually exciting rural social issues will abound at the same time that rural sociologists are adopting a greater diversity of approaches (such as political economy) to these issues.

Although the harvest of the rural sociological enterprise in the coming years is undoubtedly promising, the potential costs of achieving it will also be high (Buttel, 1981). The new approaches of many rural sociologists will address important issues in ways not previously examined -- and not well understood -- by many international agencies. For example, rural sociologists may wonder about the basic worth and design of programs instead of the organizational details that might make accepted programs perform more smoothly. Research agendas may be couched as structural questions, and these may endanger the low profile that we had in the "heyday" of adoption/diffusion, status attainment, and subculture-of the-peasantry theories, in which the individual and his culture were viewed as the culprits of underdevelopment. Newby (1981) warns that structural analysis has strong appeal to the current generation of graduate students but is politically and ideologically incompatible with many institutions with whom rural sociologists interact. I do not wish to imply that the international work of rural sociology has been premised on examining trivial questions in innocuous ways. Archibald O. Haller of the University of Wisconsin was decorated by the Brazilian Government for the contributions his work on status attainment has for future generations through building new institutions, but the fact remains that rural sociology is a vulnerable component within the agencies treating international development. Renegotiating the role of rural sociology within these agencies involves great risk. There is considerable sensitivity to our projects, especially when politically unpopular topics are analyzed (Campbell _et_ _al._, 1981). I am afraid that I have no set of recommendations for managing what seem likely to be increasingly common crises of survival for an internationally more active rural sociology. It is, however, essential that rural sociologists understand the current status and trends of the discipline in international work as well as the role of rural sociologists in international research as viewed by non-sociologists.

Current Trends in International Development and the Status of Rural Sociology

In the early 1950s development assistance programs were designed to help create physical infrastructures and to assist specific groups such as farmers. The emphasis of projects lay on developing the economies of emerging nations and on building institutions that would facilitate this development. In the 1970s donor agencies and countries began to feel that the "trickle down" strategy of development -- a strategy in which assistance was concentrated on economic sectors with the greatest likelihood for growth in expectation that the benefits of this growth would "trickle" from the upper classes to the lower -- was not reaching the "poorest of the poor," "the poor majority" or "the lowest 40 percent." Educational programs of the time focused on the development of universities and the training of personnel who could lead economic development, and not on primary and secondary education.

These concerns have since shifted the focus of development assistance programs to the "poorest of the poor," usually the rural majority. Assistance programs strive to involve the poor themselves in the identification of their problems and in setting goals for improvement of their situation. Program and project emphasis has thus moved from institution building and infrastructural inputs to the issue of more equitable distribution of the benefits of development. Development assistance is aimed directly at the poor majority through population control, health care, provision of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

primary and secondary education, nutrition, and small farmer projects. These programs are designed to help the poor meet their "basic needs" while addressing their income and employment needs. The assumption is that programs stressing appropriate technology, integrated rural development, etc., will reduce societal inequalities between classes.

Concern is being heard, in some developmental circles, that the efforts directed at the "poorest of the poor" are failing because no emphasis has been placed on economic growth or institution building. Some agencies are advocating abandoning the "poor majority" projects in favor of economic growth policies -- cash grants, commodity import programs and large scale development projects. Most assistance programs, however, are stressing a "balanced" approach that puts continued emphasis on the poorest rural dwellers in underdeveloped countries while making the projects economically viable. Significant private-sector participation and greater attention to technology transfer, as well as "bricks and mortar" infrastructural projects, are thought to be needed. In theory, the upper classes in developing nations will welcome this approach because the poor will become active contributors to the economy if income generating efforts are successful (see USAID, 1981).

Since the shift in development policies in the 1970s, a wider role for rural sociologists has emerged and will continue to emerge. There has, however, developed a split between those studying equity questions and those studying technological transfer questions. This split will be examined later. It is against this backdrop, however, that I wish to explore the current status of rural sociology in international development. In recent months there has been much talk in government agencies, universities and foundations about the decline of training for U.S. professionals in the area of international development (see Fienup and Riley, 1980; Flinn, 1980 and 1981). After the decade of development -- the 1960s -- few rural sociologists were trained in development issues. Koppel and Beal (in process) found a decline in the absolute number of Ph.D.s trained in rural sociology programs in development between 1960-70 and 1970-80. There was also a change in the composition of these Ph.D.s -- proportionally more foreign than domestic candidates in the 1970s. The most dramatic change, however, was in the decrease in dissertation research completed from primary data collected abroad. Today, our domestic graduate students often face insurmountable difficulties in securing research funds for dissertation work overseas. In addition, funding for language programs such as NDEA has been cut and prospects for the future are not bright. These trends have led to a "graying" of the cadre of rural sociologists working in international development (Flinn, 1980).

Concern extends beyond the training of new rural sociologists in the 1970s. It also encompasses an inability to attract qualified senior staff into overseas work (see Wharton, 1980; Whitaker, 1980). Many professors see development as a separate career track from teaching, research and extension. Moreover, state funding has traditionally focused on domestic needs within state boundaries. Retirees are often replaced with individuals who have a purely domestic orientation; commodity interests within a state are given priority in the hiring of staff members. Cuts in federal funds have resulted in fewer soft monied non-tenure track positions with which to "bring in internationalists" and "work them into" a tenure track position. By any measure, there has been a decline in the numbers of U.S. rural sociologists working on international development and of domestic students attempting research in the field.

Paradoxically, the turn away from international rural sociological work and the concomitant decline in the number of young professionals developing international careers is taking place while the demand for internationalists is high and apparently growing. The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development/USAID has begun to use a "collaborative assistance" mode of contracting that permits universities to participate in the design of overseas projects (as well as their implementation) through cooperation with AID and the host governments. AID is also trying to develop a mechanism (currently called Technical Service to Mission, or TSM) to obtain short-term assistance of university personnel for specific tasks. The TSM will attempt to meet both AID and university needs and constraints through advanced planning for short-term inputs. This type of backstopping is needed by AID because of its staffing difficulties. For example, a recent seminar in Wisconsin indicated that the AID staff includes fewer than 200 full-time agriculturalists.

This is only a partial picture of changes affecting the profession of rural sociology. Most of our institutions have, as noted, seen declines in graduate enrollments of domestic students in the discipline. Ironically, this is happening during the so-called "rural renaissance." Perhaps the decline has been brought on by publicity about the depressed job market for Ph.D.s in general. In many cases, however, the loss of domestic graduate students has been offset by rising numbers of foreign students. A recent study (Baumer, 1979) of member graduate schools by the Committee for Institutional Cooperation (CIC) showed a 25 percent increase in foreign student enrollment between 1974 and 1979. On most of these campuses, foreign students constituted approximately 16 percent of the graduate population but on some campuses the proportion reached as high as 27 percent of the graduate student body. Many of these foreign graduate students seem to concentrate their studies in agriculture, engineering, sociology, economics, mathematics, and chemistry. At Ohio State University, for example, 40 of the 78 graduate students in agricultural economics are foreign students but only 5 professors are self-identified internationalists. In the social sciences that deal with cultural content in specific countries, the lack of professors knowledgeable about specific cultures and economic systems means problems in providing training for foreign students. The natural sciences are faced with a different problem but one which may be a warning to the social sciences. In many areas of the natural sciences, the proportion of foreign graduate students runs as high as 80 percent. This recently led one department chairman to lament that all applicants for an assistant professorship were foreigners.

Although the CIC figures provide little background on these foreign students, discussions with agricultural officers and AID mission directors led me to believe that the process may be selective. Many of the agency people in Latin America say that large numbers of lower and lower-middle class students are given scholarships for graduate study by Russia, Cuba, and the East-Bloc countries. At the same time, there are said to be fewer and fewer scholarships for foreign students from U.S. agencies and foundations. As a consequence, many of the students studying in the United States are thought to be from upper-class backgrounds -- that is, those who can pay their own way. This class bias could have very serious implications for U.S. rural sociologists conducting future research in foreign countries. At the very least, more U.S. rural sociologists will have to learn Marxian sociology and theories of political economy to communicate with their host-country counterparts.

Fragility of International Programs

International programs in rural sociology are few in number and seem to be built on unstable funding. For example, in 1966 -- through the efforts of A. Eugene Havens -- the University of Wisconsin-Madison's program in the Sociology of Development was founded. Initial funding was provided by a Ford Foundation Grant to the University's office of International Studies and Programs with subsequent monies for traineeships from NIH. Outside funding ceased

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in 1975, but the program -- now called the sociology of economic change -- continues to attract large numbers of foreign students. Some professors formerly associated with the program have formed a class analysis program -- a new trend in rural sociological study. At Cornell the Ph.D. degree in Development Sociology cuts across both domestic and international concerns but has no stable source of funding. The only new program initiative is at Kentucky where an international sociology program is being developed with the use of Title XII Strengthening Grant Funds.

Since it is difficult to rationalize the use of state funds for international positions, there are few explicit international appointments in rural sociology faculties, and only a few departmental programs offer course work in international development. For example, a recent survey of 20 departments offering course work in rural sociology indicates that less than half had one or more courses in international development (Green and Flinn, n.d.). Very few departments -- Wisconsin, Missouri, Cornell, Kentucky, Ohio State and perhaps some others -- offer written preliminary examinations or the Ph.D. in the area of international development.

In general, rural sociologists interested in international development must "steal" time from their domestic responsibilities. This bootlegging of time requires the rural sociologist with international interests to perform two jobs instead of one in maintaining a good domestic as well as a good international program. When a faculty member returns from overseas, he or she is often rewarded with extra courses or work to make up for the time spent away. Many are unwilling to pay these penalties for overseas assignments.

International work can create other career problems, especially for younger faculty. In order to bestow tenure the system requires large quantities of theoretically and methodologically sound research. Overseas research is difficult and time consuming; publications are slow to emerge and the lack of sampling frames etc. often affects the methodological sophistication of the research. As a result tenure committees often underrate the contributions of the internationally oriented rural sociologist who comes before them.

The fragility of international rural sociology programs is reflected in the training -- or lack of training -- of professionals. Many "international" rural sociologists have no special training in the sociology of economic change, history or area studies. Others have no language skills. Most important, very few have had any formal training in comparative sociology or have conducted comparative studies (for exceptions, see Rogers, 1962; Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971; and Haller, 1970). Rural sociologists have too often drifted into overseas assignments with tools that ill equip them for international work.

This affliction is also prevalent in the parent discipline of sociology. Webber (1981:416) notes that...

> most sociological studies are conducted within one society, and few theoretical propositons can find support in research results based on comparative data from many societies.

Because a majority of the sociologists reside in the United States, Webber (1981:425) speculates that they can be divided into two categories, those who tend to be preoccupied with the structure, process and change of their own society and those who tend to consider the organization and functioning of American society in a world-wide context. Although the number of comparative studies conducted by those in the latter category are on the upswing, the pervasiveness of American provincialism has led to the production of few if any statements about human relationships on truly general levels.

The Role of the Rural Sociologist in International Research

In the international arena it became natural for the rural sociologist to apply the social scientific perspective of diffusionism to the Third World. Adoption/diffusion theory, one may argue in retrospect, was fashioned at a time of accelerated use of fossil fuels -- especially petroleum. The theory assumed that technological change would always move toward the progressive substitution of inanimate energy for animate energy. This assumption is plainly unwarranted for most of the Third World. Insofar as rural sociologists tended to speed the adoption of capital-intensive, energy-intensive, labor-displacing technologies, their role in the adoption/diffusion process contributed to social problems in the Third World, where an abundance of labor but a shortage of capital and energy persist. Recognition of these effects has undoubtedly prompted the reorientation of adoption theories to consider "alternative," "intermediate" and "appropriate" technologies. The non-transferability of much of U.S. rural sociology to the Third World is now admitted, as is the potential of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reverse technological flows of "alternative" methods from developing to developed nations (Buttel and Flinn, 1980). In short, the current role of rural sociology is often viewed by non-sociologists as a resurrection of a sophisticated adoption-of-innovations model.

Although rural sociologists and anthropologists are increasingly involved in international research, much of the motivation for their participation is perfunctory. It often has to do with "social soundness" requirements of projects. Rural sociologists are "brought into" projects to prove that the roles of women, environmental concerns, the poorest of the poor and small farmers have been adequately treated. As Bledsoe (1980:23) puts it:

> Adding social soundness as a checklist item in most cases seems to marginalize and trivialize the issues that it quite validly raises, and it only becomes an irritating thorn in the side of project designers who must dig up a social scientist to come up with some local ethnography to justify a project that will almost certainly be accepted anyway.

Although the argument can be taken too far, international rural sociologists over the past decade have in a sense assumed a legitimation role. I do not imply that some have sold their souls for a few dollars, but that socially conscious people have often been co-opted in the name of ecology, women's rights, etc. On the other hand Campbell et al. (1981) argue that rural sociologists do play a "conscience role" for multi-disciplinary research teams by generating awareness of the consequences of technologies for different segments of the study population.

As a result of the legitimation role (or an unwillingness to play this role) rural sociologists have often come to be viewed as idiosyncratic, as stumbling blocks to production projects, or as problem people to be "dealt with" before the "real" project can be performed. The outcome can be tokenism and stereotyping of rural sociologists as troublemakers.

Tokenism on international committees and technological projects tends to isolate rural sociologists. Isolation hinders communication over sociological problems within or between projects, so that the sociological viewpoint is represented but often inadequately presented to the project team. For the rural sociologist, there begins to emerge a need to "fit in" with the technological personnel, not vice versa. He or she must learn to speak the language of the soil scientists or agronomists to demonstrate that sociologists are "all right" before credibility can be established. As one sociologist remarked, "You must be a 'dirtboy' first and a sociologist second to make a meaningful contribution."

Another crucial aspect of the growing involvement of rural sociologists in agricultural research programs is their subordinate role on research and proposal-writing teams. Projects tend to be defined by technologists and by bureaucratic priorities of the funding agencies. Rural sociologists are "brought in" afterward to ameliorate any "side effects" but not to change the basic design or the essential goals of the project. Although project members may be quite earnestly interested in what rural sociologists can offer, the raison d'etre of such projects is ultimately defined by production agriculturalists.

A Critique of Farming Systems and Integrated Rural Development as Effective Vehicles for Rural Sociological Involvement in Third World Development

Their isolation and subordinate status on international projects have led rural sociologists to abdicate the role of formulating research priorities. They have deferred to groups outside the profession, particularly to economists, soil scientists and granting agencies. The 1970s have seen some reversal of this trend to be sure -- especially with the formulation of dependency theory and the sociology of agriculture -- yet most projects do not ask sociological questions at the outset, and they are thus biased against meaningful sociological input. Subordinate roles for rural sociologists are reinforced. A cursory critique of some "hot" topics as effective vehicles for rural sociological involvement in Third World development may help to demonstrate this point.

The farming system approach sets strict limits on the research. Those limits are the farmer himself and the resources he has to work with on his small piece of land (Harwood, 1979:6). Many contemporary rural sociologists, however, find it difficult to ignore the interrelationships between small-scale farmers and the estate or plantation sector. Exploration of the role of the peasantry as a source of cheap semi-servile labor is a burning sociological question that non-sociologists may quickly brand as troublemaking.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On the other hand, a basic objective of small farm research is to identify situations in which existing farm resources are inefficiently used. The research work is a success when it defines changes in the farming system that result in increased productivity. The sociologist, however, notes that the benefits of increased productivity on small farms may not be captured by small farmers. Increased productivity in the subsistence sector may lower reproduction costs of rural laborers and allow large landowners to reduce their wages; again an important sociological question is clearly out of bounds in the farming system context.

Implicit in farming systems research is the assumption that one can "revitalize" the small farm sector by improving the efficiency with which available resources are used. However, sociologists are likely to contend that whatever small farmers can use, large farmers can often use as well or better because the latter have better quality land, more credit and less risk. Management tools and technologies, sociologists say, must be viewed in a broad social and political context; they are not simply neutral tools for solving problems, but part of the structure of society. Sociologists will often want to examine the extent to which farming systems research reinforces the existing social and political inequalities of a society. They do not necessarily assume that successful research will "revitalize" the small farm sector of an unequal society.

Farming systems researchers do recognize that farmers have their own goals and priorities that figure as importantly as "objective" physical and biological considerations in decisions about how to farm, but such "subjective" values and motivations are difficult to put into the decision equation. By a short stretch of the imagination, non-sociologists may see the subject matter of sociology as irrational, uneconomic and non-quantifiable. However, rather than neglecting these "subjective" aspects or, at worst, blaming the small farmer for his own inferior circumstances, many contemporary rural sociologists would inquire about the economic and poltical structure that brings forth the small farmer's attitudes.

Another "new approach," integrated rural development (IRD), has enjoyed a vogue among development planners, foreign and domestic agencies and politicians in many Third World countries. Community development in the United States has been criticized as a compensatory mechanism to help rural residents cope with the adverse effects of a changing agriculture, and it is also criticized abroad by sociologists as a remedy without institutional change. Integrated rural development programmers assert that peasants will not be able to rise above centuries of poverty and exploitation unless they are supplied with access to credit, extension, green revolution technology, water, roads, markets, health facilities, education and non-farm employment. The approach is directed toward providing locally appropriate packages of such goods and services to rural communities. Although integrated rural development is seen as a grassroots, "bootstrap" approach to development, central planning and coordination is an important aspect of program implementation.

As in the case of farming systems analysis, the targets of integrated rural development are treated as separate entities -- as viable communities that are self-governed political entities. Many sociologists, however, would inquire about the interdependence of local communities and the larger society -- issues, for example, such as "cheap food" policies in which prices paid to peasants for produce are artifically held down in order to subsidize and prevent probelems with urban workers (Janvry, 1981).

In the IRD approach, the government is seen as a facilitator and promoter of the common good in assisting local people to develop an institutional framework through participatory democracy. Many rural sociologists might question the "good" intentions of governments that are essentially representative of an upper class that wants to maintain the current political-economic system. In this view, IRD may be little more that a pacification project that affects precious few people and communities -- a token gesture by the government to give the illusion of help and progress. A sociological analysis might instead question whether a feasible solution to rural economic and social problems could be offered without basic changes in national society.

Indeed, Finan and Fox (1980:21) conclude in their study of an integrated rural development project in Ibiapaba, Brazil that:

> The structure of rural Brazilian society, more than the good intentions of the planners, influences the distributions of project benefits. To the extent that both the IRD and the community development approaches failed to recognize this major barrier, the long range effects of their efforts have been attenuated.

Grindle's (1980) study of two IRD projects, PIDER in Mexico and DRI in Colombia, indicates that such programs...

> cannot offer a feasible solution to rural economic and social problems unless basic changes are made in the direction of national development policies, the structure of landholdings, and the political power of peasant groups.

The major interests of many rural sociologists are not what holds the local community together or makes a farm system function more efficiently, but who controls the allocation of resources, how these resources are allocated, and the consequences of the extant allocation of resources for the lives of people in the society.

The Future of Rural Sociology in International Development

Because rural sociology is an applied field in the eyes of many international development specialists, the U.S. version of the discipline has in the past played an ameliorative role in social change. The emphasis on empirical methods and an ahistorical approach were suited to modernization and subculture of poverty theories, which gave an anti-Marxist slant to the U.S. development literature. In addition, status attainment studies did not emphasize social class variables such as earnings (Falk, 1980). Diffusionist theoriies were involved with peasants' "inappropriate" ideas and "irrational" values and with prescribed "remedies" such as education, green revolution technology and resocialization. As Kahl (1976) notes, these are philosophies to be expected from a U.S. society that felt it had solved its fundamental problems and needed only minor reforms to function well; minor reforms would obviously work in the foreign countries too.

These "remedies" also fit well with the needs of foreign

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

governments and international development agencies. Foreign governments have generally been wary of acting on structural characteristics associated with poverty because such action would inevitably affect power relationships; they have usually preferred measures that might help the poor without requiring structural change. International agencies, ever mindful of this, believe that they cannot press for certain types of structural changes if they want to continue to be a welcome force for development in a host country (USAID, 1975 and 1981).

As a consequence, U.S. rural sociologists have often exported adoption/diffusion, micro-level community analysis, modernity, etc. Recently, however, following the lead of our Latin American counterparts studying dependency/internal colonialism and our European brethren examining class analysis, U.S. rural sociologists have increasingly emphasized macro-level historical analyses. This emphasis on political and social class issues has produced an uneasiness among colleagues in other disciplines and may force a renegotiation of the role of rural sociology in international development.

In the changing nature of the discipline, some rural sociologists see opportunities while others see only pitfalls (Ensminger, 1980; Lowdermilk, 1981; and Gray, in process). The problem is, of course, consensus theory (Durkheim) vs. conflict theories (Weber and Marx); different but important questions are asked. The former views the primary causal forces underlying social change as values and culture while the latter feel that social power, large scale bureaucratic organizations, class conflict, contradictions and exploitation are the primary causes. A synthesis of these positions seems unlikely and futile (Buttel and Flinn, 1980). This problem of differing views of reality is also present in other social sciences (for example, see Ward, 1979).

The error in this, according to Horton (1970:170), is not that sociologists think normatively but that they are unaware of it. It is my belief that rural sociologists must play a major role in pointing out the implicit assumptions and limitations of various theories to our colleagues in other disciplines. Awareness may help them, and us, avoid some of the gross errors of myopia -- mistaking our own normative categories for "objective" fact and projecting short-sightedness onto others (Horton, 1970). If one wishes to work in IRD, for instance, he or she should be well aware of the questions which the theory can answer as well as its assumptions, limitations and restrictions so as not to "oversell" the policy implications. In this manner, some changes might be more effectively introduced without advertising the "remedies" as cure-alls.

This cautious approach requires a fundamental redefinition of the scope of rural sociology. Instead of conceiving of rural sociology as a specialized discipline that studies the residual phenomena not pre-empted by other disciplines, we must strive toward a rural sociology that is a comprehensive and integrative discipline, one that is as much at home in agricultural economics as it is in political science. Our credibility as an intellectual force, especially for policy makers, will depend on our ability to marshall evidence from the whole realm of socioeconomic structure and process, rather than from merely the subset that we often sheepishly label as "sociological." The implications of this argument are several. Graduate training must become more interdisciplinary. Intellectual engagement with persons from other disciplines, especially history and economics, must be encouraged. Our theoretical work must become more courageous in exploring phenomena formerly relegated to economics, political science and other disciplinary groups. The posture that most effectively depicts this new orientation is political economy, although I quickly add that theoretical styles within a political economy perspective can and should remain diverse; I do not suggest that rural sociology in international development embrace any particular theoretical orthodoxy. My argument is that rural sociology must expand the scope of its subject matter -- not by fragmenting research topics but by conceiving of sociology as an overarching, integrative socioeconomic science.

I noted earlier that rural sociology has traditionally abdicated the role of formulating research priorities and has deferred to groups outside of the profession. We are seeing some reversal of this trend in the lead that the University of Missouri's rural sociologists have taken in Title XII: Small-Ruminants Collaborative Research Support Program. The rural sociology project, and a companion economics project, are unique in that they are assigned responsibilities in all the foreign work sites whereas the biological projects work in one or at most two sites. Rural sociological research has been undertaken in Kenya, Indonesia, Peru and Brazil and work will begin in Morocco. The long-run objective of the project is to offer the biological scientists suggestions on the types of new technologies that might be acceptable within the social and cultural contexts of these societies.

With declining college enrollments and budgets, few new positions in universities are likely and even fewer in international development. The only area of growth for international rural sociologists may be in federal agencies. A critical posture in agency work is difficult to "sell." The "conscious role" can be very important in the future but respect for such a role must be gained by quality research and students. The steps rural sociologists take to ensure project success and (more important) project evaluation will be essential to the long run public support for foreign aid and technical assistance. A meaningful dialogue on development issues can help to establish the usefulness and legitimacy of rural sociology.

The major theoretical contributions will in practice come, I think, from our foreign students who return home and develop a comparative persepctive. Moreover, Canadian and European sociologists will probably play larger roles in developing theories of socioeconomic change because their funding sources are less restrictive. They are also more familiar with theories of political economy.

I am, however, encouraged by the recent resurgent attention to institution building among agency and foundation people. Our best success stories have been in training people, both domestic and foreign, for international work. On the other hand, our success with institution-building is varied. Brazilian universities have developed rural sociology programs (Hansen _et al._, 1979) while Colombian universities have not. The Colombians trained in the United States have remained in country but are practicing rural sociology outside academia (Aristizobal, in process). This is undoubtedly due to the Colombian Marxist sociologists' reception to the heavy input of U.S. rural sociologists in their program structure, producing a style similar to U.S. programs -- anti-Marxian. This did not always fit the Latin context.

Perhaps we will once again move in the direction of institutional and human capital development, but not repeat our previous mistakes by involving more Canadian, Australian and European rural sociologists and by sending students to Europe and Third World universities as well as U.S. institutions. As a consequence, a single U.S. university or program will not produce the "Wisconsin Boys" or the "Cornell Mafia" who return home and are charged by their peers as being apologists for "Imperialistic U.S. Sociology." The latter views bourgeois sociology as an ideological framework which serves not to liberate but instead to mystify, not to explain but more often to explain away this situation.

References

Aristizobal, Gilberto
In process. "The Sociology of Rural Sociology in Colombia." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Rural Sociology, The Ohio State University.

Baumer, Elmer F.
1979 "Foreign Student Enrollments at CIC Institutions." Paper presented at the meeting of the Committee on International Cooperation, Iowa City, Iowa.

Bledsoe, Caroline
1980 "Defining and Analyzing the Rural Poor." Development Studies Program, USAID, January.

Brandt, Willy
1980 North-South: A Program for Survival. Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press.

Buttel, Frederick H.
1981 "Some Observations on the Future of Rural Sociology." Presented at the 50th Anniversary Symposium of the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, May 1981.

Buttel, Frederick H. and William L. Flinn
1980 "Social Barriers to the Adoption of Foreign and Alternative Technologies by the United States." Studies in the Diffusion of Innovations, Discussion Paper Number 52, Department of Geography, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Campbell, Rex R., Michael F. Nolan, and John F. Galliher
1981 "Reflections on Title XII: The Case of Sociology in the Small-ruminants Collaborative Research Program." The Rural Sociologist 1 (January): 2-10.

Dahlberg, Kenneth A.
1979 Beyond the Green Revolution. The Ecology and Politics of Global Agriculture Development. New York: Plenum Press.

Ensminger, Douglas
1980 "Contributions of Rural Sociology to the Development and Functioning of Institutions in Developing Countries." Newsline (Rural Sociology Society) 8 (November): 27-36.

Falk, William W.
1980 "Stratification and Status Attainment Group: Whither Thou Goest?" Newsline (Rural Sociology Society) 8 (January): 4.

Fienup, Darrell F. and Harold M. Riley
1980 Training Agricultural Economists for Work in International Development. East Lansing, Michigan, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University.

Finan, Timothy J. and Roger W. Fox
1980 "Integrated Rural Development Programs in Northeast Brazil: The Case of the Ibiapaba Project." Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Latin American Studies Association and the Midwest Association of Latin American Studies, Indiana University, October 17-19.

Flinn, William L.
1980 "The Graying of Rural Sociologists in International Development -- and Related Social Class Stories." Newsline (Rural Sociology Society) 8 (September): 32-35.

1981 "The Effect of Overseas Assignments on the Careers of USDA Employees." Report of a Survey of Resident Overseas Participants, Administrators, and Colleagues. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Gray, Thomas Walter
In process. "Functional-Consensus and Historical-Materialist World Views: Their Implicit Assumption." Ph.D. dissertation.

Green, Kenneth and William L. FLinn
n.d. Study of Selected Rural Sociology Programs and Their Course Contents. Columbus, Ohio, Department of Rural Sociology, Ohio State University.

Griffin, Keith
1974 The Political Economy of Agrarian Change. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Grindle, Merilee S.
1980 "Prospects for Integrated Rural Development: Evidence from Mexico and Colombia." Paper presented at the Joint Meetings of the Latin American Studies Association and the Midwest Association of Latin American Studies, Indiana University, October 17-19.

Haller, Archibald O.
1970 "Changes in the Structure of Status Systems." Rural Sociology 35 (4):469-487.

Hansen, David O., Ivo A. Schneider and Vicente de Paula Vitor
1979 "Rural Sociology in Brazil -- Institutional Growth, 1965-1977." International Review of Modern Sociology 9 (January-June):31-48.

Harwood, Richard R.
1979 Small Farm Development: Understanding and Improving Farming Systems in the Humid Tropics. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Horton, John
1970 "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies." In Larry T. Reynolds and Janice M. Reynolds (eds.), The Sociology of Sociology. New York: David McKay.

Janvry, Alain de
1981 The Agrarian Question and Reformism in Latin America. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore and London.

Kahl, Joseph A.
1976 Modernization, Exploitation and Dependency in Latin America. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, Inc.

Koppel, Bruce and George M. Beal
In process Graduate Education for International Development: A First Report of American Rural Sociology. East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Loudermilk, Mark
1981 "Potential Contributors of Rural Sociology to a New International Development Emphasis." The Rural Sociologist 1:289-296.

Nelson, Lowry
1969 Rural Sociology. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Newby, Howard
1981 "Rural Sociology in the United States: A European View." Paper presented at the 50th Anniversary Symposium of the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, May 1981.

Pearse, Andrew
1980 Seeds of Plenty, Seeds of Want. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, Everett M.
1962 Diffusion of Innovations. New York: Free Press.

Rogers, Everett with F. Floyd Shoemaker
1971 Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Sewell, William H.
1950 "Needed Research in Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 12(2):21-22.

USAID
1975 Implications of "New Directions" in Development Assistance. Washington, D.C.

1981 "The New Directions Mandate and the Agency for International Development." Paper prepared for House Government Operations Committee by the Foreign Affairs and National Defense Division, Congressional Research Service.

Ward, Benjamin
1979 The Ideal Worlds of Economics: Liberal, Radical, and Conservative Economic World Views. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Webber, Irving L.
1981 "Sociology: Parochial or Universal?" Social Forces 60(2):416-431.

Wharton, Clifton R.
1980 "Tomorrow's Development Professionals: Where Will the Future Come From?" Paper presented at the meeting of the American Agricultural Economics Association, Urbana, Illinois.

Whitaker, Morris
1980 "Toward More Effective Involvement of Title XII Universities in International Agricultural Development." Paper presented to the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development, AID/IDCA, Washington, D.C.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES:
A EUROPEAN VIEW

by

Howard Newby*

"The concrete development of sociology is of course not the product only of social processes imminent to the field. It is the result of social and intellectual forces internal to the discipline with both of these being influenced by the environing social structure . . . ."

Robert Merton (1959, p.23)

"Narcissism . . . is the search for gratification of the self which at the same time prevents that gratification from occurring. This psychic state is not created by a cultural condition; it is a possibility of character for any human being. But narcissism may be encouraged by cultual developments and can vary in expression from era to era so that in some circumstances it may seem tiresome, in others, pathetic, in others an affliction shared in common."

Richard Sennett (1977, p.220)

---

*Professor of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Anniversaries are traditionally times for reflections on the past, celebrations of the present and hopes for the future. This paper is oriented primarily towards the future. It is intended to direct attention towards the ways in which rural sociology in the United States might develop over the next decade. However, it does so in an oblique, not to say eccentric, way. It is not the purpose of this paper to construct a research agenda for the 1980s, nor does this paper examine in any systematic way current developments in rural sociology in order to project them into the future. Instead this paper is a reflection on reflexive rural sociology, a journey into a sociological hall of mirrors which attempts to assess the utility of writing papers which deal with "the state of the art" of rural sociology. The relevance of this exercise to the future of rural sociology in the United States will hopefully become clear as the paper proceeds.

This approach is prompted by two considerations. The first one is personal. I am not particularly proud of the fact that this is the sixth occasion in two years that I have found myself constructing a paper which assesses the current state of rural sociology (the others are Newby, 1980; 1981a; 1981b; 1981c; Newby and Buttel, 1980; only the last of these was not an invitation). This has had three unfortunate effects: I am running out of things to say; I am becoming increasingly cynical about the power of rational argument in sociological discourse; this sociologist's attention, at least, is being diverted from what should arguably be the first priority of sociologists -- the study of society, rather than the study of ourselves. However, this paper is also prompted by a second set of factors, namely that the examination of rural sociology's "private troubles" has, throughout the 1970s, continued to vie for attention with rural sociologists' investigations of "public issues" (the distinction, of course, is that of Mills, 1959), indicative of the declining consensus which has typified American rural sociology since the late 1960s. It has often been overlooked how, for all the accusations of being atheoretical and crassly trivial, American rural sociology has shown a distinct tendency to engage in agonized introspection (see Sewell, 1965, pp. 428-9, fn. 3; Bealer, 1975; Newby, 1980). This seems to have increased during the 1970s. (This is discussed at greater length in Newby, 1980, but examples include Copp, 1972; Ford, 1973; Nolan and Galliher, 1973; Warner, 1974; Nolan and Hagan, 1975; Lowry, 1977; Picou _et_ _al_., 1978; Falk and Pinhey, 1978; Olson, 1979). One of the more depressing aspects of this introspective mood concerns the fact that old issues keep re-appearing (cf. Anderson, 1959; Sewell, 1950, 1965) in substantially the same form. Perhaps the latest example of rural sociologists rediscovering the wheel is the recent exchange in _The Rural Sociologist_ over rural sociology and rural policy (Bealer 1981a,b; Pinhey, 1981; Gilbert, 1981; Falk, 1981; Christenson, 1981).

This is not to designate the discussion of our "private troubles" for this _is_ rural sociology no less than the implementation of a survey, but it does raise some pertinent issues relating to the sociology of rural sociological knowledge. One problem clearly relates to how these reflexive statements are to be interpreted. On the one hand they might be regarded as little more than the manifestation of the institutionalized excuse which the annual presidential address at the Rural Sociological Society meetings customarily gives for some indiscreet navel-gazing; on the other hand the penchant for introspection might be the product of internal and external crisis in the discipline which has demanded a fresh research agenda. The truth probably lies somewhere between the two. However, as I have argued at length elsewhere (Newby 1980), it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in the last decade American rural sociology's "private troubles" have been associated with the growing suspicion that increasing technical competence in research methodology has not compensated for increasing theoretical sterility, while major "public issues" have also arisen over how to make rural sociological research more policy relevant. At times rural sociologists have looked embarrassingly ill-equipped to deal with emergent rural problems -- both sociological and social.

This is not, however, a reason for undue despondency. On the contrary, the single most beneficial aspect of this state of affairs has been the opening up of rural sociology in the United States to new ideas and approaches which no longer have to struggle quite so hard as in the past in order to claim some sub-disciplinary legitimacy. There are now, for example, considerable signs of the emergence of a structural, critical, more theoretically informed rural sociology centered upon the sociology of agriculture (Buttel and Newby, 1980) with the potentiality, at least, of constructing an exciting research agenda for the 1980s, one which might bring about a transcendence of the demoralizing malaise of the 1970s. Before, however, complacent optimism becomes rampant, it is necessary to draw attention to two possible dangers to this enterprise. One concerns the looming institutional context within which any such radical departure will have to take place. I have elaborated on this elsewhere (Newby, 1981c) and at this point merely wish to proffer the reminder that any "new" rural sociology remains distinctly a minority interest, a fragile coalition which has found some room where rural sociology's theoretical disarray and policy-makers' concerns for "structure issues" intersect. We have historical reminders of how easily this can be snuffed out by a reassertion of political and institutional realities (Kirkendall, 1966; Goldschmidt, 1979).

The second danger concerns the possibility that any new agenda might be stifled by an orgy of self-absorption, so that endless *a priori* theoretical speculation emerges as a reaction to the narrow empiricism of the past. Current issues in rural sociology are not going to be solved by continuing introspection, nor by argument at the purely theoretical or meta-theoretical level (*pace* the recent participants to the debate in *The Rural Sociologist*), still less by a Talmudic reading of classical texts. This is *not* an argument for an inductive rural sociology, for reflexivity is an important and necessary part of the sociological enterprise, but it is an argument that rural sociologists should be aware of the limits and possibilities of such an exercise. The remainder of this paper is an attempt to deal with this -- an admittedly risky venture since my own arguments could be used as the basis of an auto-critique.

The Rise of the Narcissist Society

This task may be undertaken via a perspective on contemporary American society which seems a long way from the concerns of rural sociologists (cf. Newby and Bell, 1981). A persistent theme of recent social commentary by the American Left has concerned the growth of what Christopher Lasch (1976, 1979) has called "the narcissist society." Narcissism, in the view of a number of writers (e.g. Schur, 1976; Hougan, 1976; Sennett, 1977), was a characteristic feature of the 1970s, the "world view of the resigned" according to Lasch (1976, p. 10) or, in Sennett's words, "the Protestant Ethic of modern times" (1977, pp. 333-336). They all locate the growth of narcissism as part of the retreat from political activism which affected American society as the 1970s progressed, particularly when compared to the experience of the preceding decade. Lasch, for example, attributes the hunger for personal well-being and psychic security to a loss of faith in politics:

> A growing despair of changing society -- even of understanding it -- has generated on the one hand a revival of old-time religion, on the other a cult of expanded consciousness, health and personal 'growth.' Having no hope of improving their lives in any of the ways that matter, people have convinced themselves that what matters is psychic self-improvement: getting in touch with their feelings . . . immersing themselves in the wisdom of the East, jogging, learning how to 'relate,' overcoming the 'fear of pleasure.' Harmless in themselves, these pursuits,elevated to a program and wrapped in the rhetoric of 'authenticity' and 'awareness,' signify a retreat from the political turmoil of the recent past. Indeed Americans seem to wish to forget not only the Sixties, the riots, the New Left,

> the disruptions on college campuses, Vietnam, Watergate and the Nixon presidency, but their entire collective past . . . . (1976, p. 5)

A cult of personal relations therefore arose in reaction to the ultimate failure of the political movement of the 1960s to bring about the necessary structural transformations of American Society. Self-preoccupation instead of social change was the outcome. As Schur put it: "Self-awareness is the new panacea" (1976, p. 1).

Although all of these writers are concerned with collective narcissism as the dominant disposition of the 1970s, all of them also seek to understand this cultural phenomenon as part of a much more fundamental historical process. Hougan regards contemporary narcissism and "radical nostalgia" as the millenial movement of a decaying and decadent civilization. Lasch interprets narcissism as a form of excessive privatization which gained ascendency in reaction to the anarchic competitiveness of advanced capitalist society. Schur, with echoes of C. Wright Mill's essay on the bureaucratic personality (Mills, 1946), alluded to the effects of large-scale organizations and dehumanizing technology. However, by far the most detailed and subtle analysis is that of Sennett in his provocative *tour-de-force*, *The Fall of Public Man*.

Sennett's primary purpose is to chart the imbalance which he perceives between contemporary public and private life. He argues that a destructive *gemeinschaft*, a "tyranny of intimacy," is threatening to produce a total incapacity to transform the structure of modern American society. Sennett reverses the argument of

Riesman in *The Lonely Crowd*:

> Western societies are moving from something like an other-directed condition to an inner-directed condition -- except that in the midst of self-absorption no one can say what is inside. As a result, confusion has arisen between public and intimate life; people are working out in terms of personal feelings public matters which properly can be dealt with only through aides of impersonal meaning. (1977, p. 5).

Sennett is particularly worried, then, that what are essentially public *social issues* have become reduced to private *personal problems*. The twin forces of capitalism and secularism have achieved a transformation of the public arena into an inhuman and vaguely threatening presence. Our response has been to withdraw into a private world in order to create an infrastructure of authenticity. However, what begins as a humane aspiration becomes self-defeating, since the original problem is not solved, merely avoided. Personal adjustment to an alien public world increasingly involves not so much an attempt to transform that world, but to create "the personality of a refugee" (*ibid*., p. 260). The search for authenticity becomes a kind of "psychic strip-tease" (*ibid*., p. 269) whereby the measure of "real" social relationships is reckoned to be a willingness to reveal all. Social fulfillment is to be achieved by rendering the private public, so that intimacy becomes an attempt to solve what is essentially a public problem by denying that the public exists. For Sennett this is the greatest mystification of all:

> The reigning belief today is that closeness between persons is a moral good. The reigning aspiration today is to develop individual personality through experiences of closeness and warmth with others. The reigning myth today is that the evils of society can all be understood as evils of impersonality, alienation and coldness. The sum of these three is an ideology of intimacy: social relationships of all kinds are real,

> believable and authentic the closer they approach the inner psychological corners of each person. This ideology transmutes political categories into psychological categories. This ideology of intimacy defines the humanitarian spirit of a society without gods: warmth is our god. . . .
>
> The belief in closeness between persons as a moral good is in fact the product of a profound dislocation which capitalism and secular belief produced in the last century. Because of this dislocation, people sought to find personal meanings in impersonal situations, in objects, and in the objective conditions of society itself. They could not find these meanings; as the world became psychomorphic, it became mystifying . . . Thus the past built a hidden desire for stability in the overt desire for closeness between human beings . . . When the relations cannot bear these burdens, we conclude there is something wrong with the relationship, rather than with the unspoken expectations . . . Can intimacy on these terms really be a virtue? (ibid., pp. 259-260).

It is under these conditions that narcissism becomes mobilized because the meaning of all actions becomes reduced to personal motive: Is this what I really feel? Do I really mean it? Am I being genuine? The actor is thus constantly increased in the narcissistic problem of "never being able to crystalize what is authentic in one's feelings" (ibid., p. 267). In Sennett's view this "tyranny of intimacy" becomes a political catastrophe because it leads to the denial of the public realm:

> Class politics are weakened as class itself . . . is made to seem so much the expression of irate personal abilities. Localism and local autonomy are becoming widespread political creeds, as through the experience of power relations will have more human meanings the more intimate the scale -- even though the actual structures of power grow ever more into an international system. Community becomes a weapon against society, whose great vice is now seen to be its impersonality. But a community of power can only be an illusion in a society like that of the industrial West, one in which stability has been achieved by a progressive extension to the international scale of structures of economic control. In sum, the belief in direct human relations on an intimate scale has reduced as from inventory our understanding of the realities of power into guides for our own political behavior. The result is that the forces of domination or inequity remain unchallenged. (ibid., p. 339).

Sennett therefore advocates the re-establishment of the boundary between the public and the private domain as a necessary preliminary for the renovation of modern politics. Nevertheless he remains anxious about the efforts of the current obliteration of this distinction. For him narcissistic self-absorption leads only to political immobilism.

Reflexivity or Narcissism?

It has become commonplace to remark that sociology is a product of the society which it purports to explain. As an ironic observation on the history of sociological thought this has been used to debunk the scientific pretensions of sociology (cf. Hawthorn, 1977). Alternatively this fact has been welcomed, not with glum inevitability, but as part of the promise of sociology whereby the problems of modern society may be understood and resolved (cf. Mills, 1959). Whatever perspective is taken upon the causes and extent of this exogenous 'contamination' of sociological thought, few would deny its existence nor its relevance: as Urry (1973) has argued, no exclusively "internalist" account of the history of sociology is very meaningful. Thus, in retrospect at least, it is difficult to deny the relevance of the secular changes in American society during the 1950s when accounting for the influence of functionalism during that period. It resonated with the less overt class character of political and social conflict during the 1950s (the 'end of ideology'), the rising affluence of American society, the renewed confidence in material progress and so on. All of this is now very familiar, just as we are familiar with

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

accounting for the downfall of this orthodoxy by citing its inappropriateness in the late 1960s in the midst of the anti-Vietnam war movement, the riots in the urban ghettoes and the culmination ofthe American political crisis in Watergate. (This is explored further in Newby, 1981c). But if, as Sennett, Schur and others have agreed, narcissism in the 1970s represents a retreat from the political turmoil of the 1960s, in what ways has this been carried forward into contemporary sociology?

A constant artistic and literary preoccupation of the 1960s concerned the blurring of illusion and reality. Perhaps as Szelenyi (1978) has suggested, sociology was itself part of the illusion of the 1960s (see also Hodgson, 1978). In retrospect, Szelenyi argues, it is possible to discern how sociologists typically shared either a liberal or a radical illusion during this period. The liberal illusion was the belief in a new era of more enlightened technocracies and bureaucracies in which sociology would play its role by exposing the continuing existence of social anomalies and advocating, on the basis of 'scientific' investigation and some rudimentary social engineering, a set of policies which would remove them. The radical illusion, which to some degree arose in reaction to this, involved the belief that revolution was was just around the corner. This bequeathed to sociology a new social calling: the training of social critics. Borne along by a wave of expansionism in higher education during the 1960s each of these illusions, Szelenyi argues, was over-optimistic and lacked a realistic appraisal of the political and economic forces which shaped the modern world. Disillusion rapidly set in following the events of 1968 in Paris, Prague and Chicago. A further blow resulted from the failure of sociologists to foresee the stagflationary economic crisis of the 1970s. The resulting disillusion has created considerable self-doubt -- a tendency to retreat into the ivory tower and discuss ourselves rather than the "big issues" which need to be confronted in the society which surrounds us. According to Szelenyi a kind of "narcissistic self-pity" set in, an epidemic of intellectual escapism which anesthetized the sense of disillusion. This is highlighted by the preoccupation during the 1970s in Western sociology with epistemological questions and a metatheoretical "sociology of sociology" -- celebrating the "coming crisis" in sociology rather than investigating crises in society.

Is this parallel between narcissism in society and narcissism in sociology too glib to stand up to close examination? Certainly it is necessary to enter a number of important qualifications to this line of reasoning. To European eyes, at least, the characterization of the 1970s in terms of "the narcissist society" bears an unmistakable American imprint -- and a Marin County/Greenwich Village imprint at that. The preoccupations of the 1970s in other Western societies have remained arguably rather less epiphenomenal, though nonetheless intractable: economic stagflation, unemployment, poverty, etc. Moreover while European sociology during the 1970s can be characterized in terms of an increasing emphasis on speculative theorizing, a regard for epistemological issues and the growth of a 'sociology of sociology,' American sociology has by no means followed uniformly in the same direction. Indeed since the late 1960s sociological practice in the United States and Europe has become increasingly divergent.

In European sociology during the 1970s there has been a marked retreat into metatheoretical activity, which has tended to observe the distinction between the "public issues" and "private troubles" of sociology and therefore raises legitimate concern for the kind of immobilism which Sennett fears. The result has been a literal demoralization of sociology -- an "epistemological anomie" (Bell and Newby, 1977) -- since it is always possible for any given theoretical stance to "be dismissed before empirical studies have had a chance to get established, given that so much of the debate has been conducted at the level of programmatics" (Atkinson, 1977, p. 33). Yet many of the metatheoretical, and particularly the epistemological, issues can only be worked out in practice via the investigation of a particular substantive area of society -- an activity which the current wave of speculative theorizing and epistemological skepticism seems almost expressly designed to inhibit. We are back to Sennett's comments about narcissism being a search for gratification which at the same time prevents that gratification from occurring. It is important to emphasize that this is a problem which cuts across all approaches to sociology, positivistic and non-positivistic, Marxist and non-Marxist. Any theoretical or epistemological stance in sociology at the present time is vulnerable to being undermined by criticism, most of which is quite familiar to anyone who keeps up with the relevant literature. In Europe the issue of how to break with the immobilism that this has induced is widely recognized as one of the most important issues currently facing sociology, irrespective of one's theoretical stance.

In the United States the reaction to a similar set of problems has not been entirely the same. The first casualty of the "events" of the late 1960s was functionalism, which was quickly discarded as a "grand theory," and whose decline has cost the United States its intellectual ascendency in sociological theory. As I have argued elsewhere (Newby, 1981c), at the time this did not appear to be particularly serious: theories come and go; something would replace it; and, in any case, functionalism's purchase on American sociological practice was less than is sometimes alleged. The most general reaction (although by no means the only one) was simply a retreat from holistic theories of any kind in the hope that a viable theoretical sociology could be reconstituted piecemeal on the basis of methodological rigor (ably criticized by Coser, 1975). This retreat was also more conducive to the pragmatic and empirical traditions of American sociology -- in which the work of Parsons may be seen as a deviant aberration -- thereby avoiding the difficult and potentially insoluble dilemmas which have ensnared European sociologists over the last decade. Nevertheless a price has been paid. The outcome has been a sociological practice which, to an outside observer, frequently looks as though it involves going through the motions of doing technically competent but sociologically rather uninteresting research, without any apparent expectation that anyone else beyond colleagues within an extremely narrow specialization will pay any attention to it. Consequently American sociology has manifested an enormous fragmentation and a debilitating specialization, while leaving an enormous theoretical vacuum where functionalism once stood. There are now no generally acceptable sociological theories available which might guide work in particular substantive areas -- rural sociology among them. American sociology has arrived at an impasse similar to European sociology, though by a rather different route.

Today what are the alternative, general theories to a discredited functionalism which we can offer to, say, our graduate students, theories which provide an explanatory frame of reference for sociological analysis and address major contemporary social problems? At present, in the United States, there is only one: Marxism. And the rising influence of Marxism on graduate students and younger faculty in American sociology is striking. Ironically this has occurred at a time when Marxism is itself in a certain disarray (Anderson, 1979; Parkin, 1979), but at least Marxism (especially in a recession) appears relevant. The tragedy is that the abdication of most American sociologists from their theoretical responsibilities has provided no viable alternative. Perhaps sociology may fulfill this role, but it is tainted both by naturalistic assumptions which have been sociological anathema since the demise of the Chicago School and by illiberal political overtones. My personal preference for a structural, critical Weberian sociology -- arguably the mainstream approach in Britain --

is almost absent from the United States thanks to Parsons' baleful influence on the interpretation of Weber to an American audience. In any case the general withdrawal from theory in American sociology probably accounts for the fact that it has declined as a source of ideas. Throughout the 1970s the center of attention has switched, if anywhere, to Paris.

Rural Sociology and the Future

What has all this got to do with the future of rural sociology? Let me begin to answer this question by drawing two conclusions from this brief outline of our current dilemmas.

First, as I have argued elsewhere (Newby, 1980), rural sociology needs to attach itself more securely to general sociological analysis if its current problems are to be transcended -- there can be no theory of rural society without a theory of society *tout court*. Thus while general sociological theory remains in such disarray rural sociology can only suffer as a by-product. Indeed in many respects rural sociology's current theoretical predicaments are those of general sociology in microcosm. Rural sociology, too, turned to methodological rigor during the 1960s in an attempt to compensate for theoretical weakness; rural sociology also retreated from looking at the "big issues" as they affect the structure of rural America -- as Hightower (1973) reminded us. My perception, however, is that these problems are now quite widely recognized which gives some cause for legitimate optimism for the future.

Secondly, it is important to take account of Sennett's warnings concerning narcissism. Insofar as a "sociology of rural sociology"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is directed towards codifying existing sociological knowledge and deriving a new set of theoretically informed problems for investigation it is necessary, important and, above all, useful. In this sense it would be a properly reflexive rural sociology. However, insofar as it consists of a self-absorption for its own sake, and thus actually hinders or even prevents the investigation of serious social problems, then "reflexive" rural sociology quickly degenerates into a "narcissistic" rural sociology. Here there is certainly a persuasive analogy to be made with the comments of Sennett and others on collective narcissism: in rural sociology, too, self-absorption can easily lead to immobilism. In other words, I am arguing that we should not overreact to the recent history of rural sociology and retreat into undue theoretical abstractions. Nor, given the state of general sociological theory, should we attempt to have a fully-fledged solution to extremely complex theoretical problems before embarking upon sociological analysis. Rather I am arguing that we should learn from the example of the classical theorists who were simultaneously involved in the creation of sociological theory and a relevant empirical analysis of contemporary society.

I suspect that many of the reflexive papers of the 1970s have verged upon what Szelenyi calls "narcissistic self-pity," if only because the issues have been addressed in much the same way for so long. Some combination of institutional inertia and intellectual timidity prevented a critical analysis of rural America from being constructed even when many rural sociologists recognized that it was necessary. Reflexive rural sociology was the resultant cry of pain. (The clearest example of this, however, is Sewell, 1950.) Now there are some signs that this may be changing. Possibly for the first time since the early 1940s it has become politically acceptable -- even welcome -- to raise "structure" issues in a critical way, due to the "farm crisis" which was granted so much attention by the Carter administration. Traditional Jeffersonian concerns have become matters of public concern once more: the plight of family farms, trends towards concentration of production in agriculture, vertical integration with agribusiness, adequate service provision in rural areas and declining rural communities in agriculturally-dependent rural areas (see Rodefeld _et al._, 1978).

These issues have posed problems for rural sociologists which are no less acute than the theoretical and conceptual difficulties referred to above. For during the 1950s and 1960s rural sociologists had helped to lubricate the mechanisms of structural change in American agriculture by their work on such matters as the diffusion of innovations, leaving agricultural economists to deal with what was euphemistically described as "farm adjustment" (e.g., Ball and Heady, 1972). Indeed throughout this period work on the diffusion of innovations was seen as a singular success story for "scientific" rural sociology (see Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971). However, rural sociologists had approached the problem via the investigation of the social psychology of individual innovations; comparatively little attention was given to structural inhibitions on innovation acting as constraints. Moreover there tended to be a bland assumption -- which the lack of analysis of "structure" issues fostered and which was shared by and promoted by economists -- that technological change would benefit everyone. By the latter part of the 1970s it was becoming apparent that rural sociologists had naively participated in the deterioration of the social conditions of a significant sector of the rural population -- principally the poor and underprivileged -- whom rural sociologists had believed that they had been helping. This gave criticisms such as those of Hightower (1973) a pertinence which -- whatever the strident and partisan nature of the rhetoric -- would hardly be ignored. Furthermore when "structure issues" became a matter of public policy once more American rural sociology was rather ill-equipped to handle them.

There are probably more salient causes of recent developments in rural sociology than all of the "reflexive" papers written in the 1970s -- which might make the cynic question the notion of progress in sociological discourse via rational debate. Nevertheless at this point the enticing prospect arises as to whether rural sociology is better placed to face up to the big issues facing American society -- or at least the rural sector of it -- than general sociologists at the present time. The "farm crisis" of the 1970s has prompted both a critique of current structural changes and a greater willingness to consider holistic explanations of these phenomena. How much longer this will continue is difficult to say. The recent growth of interest in holistic sociology of agriculture is partly the result of a particular historical conjuncture: rural sociology's own theoretical and conceptual problems and the recent policy-relevance of "structure" issues. This could easily turn out to be a brief interlude, which is why I see the task of creating a substantial body of theoretically relevant empirical research to be an urgent one before the "environing social structure" changes to a hostile one. Rural sociology's problems cannot be arbitrated on an *a priori* basis, but only via theoretically informed investigation, the provision of supporting evidence and the cut and thrust of debate. Ultimately, as E.P. Thompson has put it, "We must reconstruct what we can" (1968, p. 542). This is why for the next fifty years I would like to spend more time in studying rural society than rural sociology, and less time writing papers like this one.

References

Anderson, C.A.
1959 "Trends in Rural Sociology." In R.K. Merton, L. Broom, and L. Cottrell (eds.), Sociology Today. New York: Basic Books.

Anderson, Perry
1979 Debates Within Western Marxism. London: NLB.

Atkinson, J. Maxwell
1977 "Coroners and the Categorisation of Deaths as Suicides: Changes in Perspective as Features of the Research Process." In C. Bell and H. Newby (eds.), Doing Sociological Research. London: Allen and Unwin.

Ball, A. G. and E. O. Heady (editors)
1972 Size, Structure and Future of Farms. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Bealer, R. C.
1975 "Theory and Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 40(4):455-477.

1981a "On Policy Matters and Rural-Urban Differences." The Rural Sociologist 1(1):19-25.

1981b "On Elephants, Chickens and Other Animals in the Zoo of Values: A Rejoinder." The Rural Sociologist 1(1):48-57.

Bell, Colin and Howard Newby
1977 "The Rise of Methodological Pluralism." In Colin Bell and Howard Newby (eds.), Doing Sociological Research. London: Allen and Unwin.

Buttel, Frederick H. and Howard Newby (editors)
1980 The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Societies: Critical Essays. Montclair, NJ: Allenheld, Osmun.

Christenson, James A.
1981 "Value Configurations for Ruralists and Urbanites: A Comment on Bealer's Paper." The Rural Sociologist 1(1):42-47.

Copp, James H.
1972 "Rural Sociology and Rural Development." Rural Sociology 37(4):515-533.

Coser, Lewis, A.
1975 "Two Methods in Search of a Substance." American Sociological Review 40(6):691-700.

Falk, William W.
1981 "Values, Functionalism and Unbroken Circles: Reactions to Bealer's Paper." The Rural Sociologist 1(1):37-41.

Falk, William W. and Thomas K. Pinhey
1978 "Making Sense of the Concept Rural and Doing Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 43(4):547-558.

Ford, Thomas R.
1973 "Toward Meeting the Social Responsibilities of Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 38(4):372-390.

Gilbert, Jess
1981 "Rural Values and Policy - or Ideology and the State: Notes on Bealer's Position." The Rural Sociologist 1(1):31-36.

Goldschmidt, Walter
1979 As Ye Sow, second edition. Montclair, NJ: Allenheld Osmun.

Hawthorn, Geoffrey
1977 Enlightenment and Despair. Cambridge: CUP.

Hightower, Jim
1973 Hard Tomatoes: Hard Times. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman.

Hodgson, Godfrey
1978 America In Our Time. London: Weldenfeld.

Hougan, Jim
1976 Decadence: Radical Nostalgia, Narcissism and Decline in the Seventies. New York: William Morrow.

Kirkendall, Richard S.
1966 Social Scientists and Farm Politics in the Age of Roosevelt. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Lasch, Christopher
1976 "The Narcissist Society." New York Review of Books, September 30th, pp. 5-11.

1979 The Culture of Narcissism. New York: Norton.

Lowry, Sheldon
1977 "Rural Sociology at the Crossroads." Rural Sociology 42(4):461-475.

Merton, Robert K.
1959 Social Conflict Over Styles of Sociological Work." Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology 3:21-44.

Mills, C. Wright
1946 "The Middle Classes in Middle-Sized Cities." American Sociological Review 2(5):520-529.

1959 The Sociological Imagination. New York: OUP.

Newby, Howard
1980 "Rural Sociology - A Trend Report." Current Sociology 28(1):1-140.

1981a "The Challenge of Rural Sociology Today." Zeitschrift fur Agrargeschichte und Agrasoziologie, forthcoming. Originally presented to the Fifth World Congress of Rural Sociology, Mexico City, 1980.

1981b "Rural Sociology and Its Relevance to Agricultural Economics: A Review." Journal of Agricultural Economics, forthcoming.

1981c "Rural Sociology in These Times." Paper presented to the Rural Sociological Society meetings, University of Guelph, August.

Newby, Howard and Colin Bell
1981 "Narcissism or Reflexivity in Recent Sociology." Polish Sociological Bulletin, forthcoming.

Newby, Howard and Frederick H. Buttel
1980 "Towards a Critical Rural Sociology." In Buttel and Newby (eds.).

Nolan, Michael F. and John F. Galliher
1973 "Rural Sociological Research and Social Policy: Hard Data, Hard Times." Rural Sociology 38(4):491-499.

Nolan, Michael F. and Robert A. Hagen
1975 "Rural Sociological Research 1966-1974: Implications for Social Policy." Rural Sociology 40(4):435-454.

Olson, P.
1979 "Public Policy and the Politics of Agriculture: Organization in Action." Rural Sociology 44(2): 266-280.

Parkin, Frank
1979 Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique. London: Tavistock.

Picou, S. et al.
1978 "Pardigms, Theories and Methods in Contemporary Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 43(4):558-583.

Pinhey, Thomas K.
1981 "Two Chickens: A Response to Bealer's Question." The Rural Sociologist 1(1):26-30.

Rodefeld, Richard D., Jan Flora, Donald Voth, Isao Fujimoto and Jim Converse (editors)
1978 Change in Rural America: Causes, Consequences and Alternatives. St. Louis, Mo: C.V. Mosby.

Rogers, E. and F. Shoemaker
1971 Communication of Innovatives: A Cross-Cultural Approach. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Schur, Edwin
1976 The Awareness Trap. New York: Quadrangle.

Sennett, R.
1977 The Fall of Public Man. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sewell, William H.
1950 "Needed Research in Rural Sociology." Rural Sociology 15(2):115-130.

1965 "Rural Sociological Research, 1936-1965." Rural Sociology 30(4):428-451.

Szelenyi, Ivan
1978 "Sociology: Illusion and Disillusion." Address to SAANZ conference, Brisbane, May.

Thompson, B.P.
1968 The Making of the English Working Class. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Urry, John
1973 "Thomas S. Kuhn as a Sociologist of Knowledge." British Journal of Sociology 24(4):462-473.

Warner, W. Keith
1974 "Rural Society in a Post-Industrial Age." Rural Sociology 39(3):306-317.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Rural Sociology Publications at the University of Wisconsin-Madison

This bibliography is intended to include all publications written by faculty and staff members while working in the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison through 1980. Before the department was established in 1930, several rural sociologists worked in the Department of Agricultural Economics, and an effort was made to include their publications as well.

This bibliography is presented in five sections: 1) books; 2) chapters in books, bulletins, and proceedings; 3) journal articles; 4) bulletins and published reports; and 5) working papers. Items in the first three sections are generally available from libraries. Recent bulletins and working papers may be obtained from the publication source, but many of the older items are out of print. Some of these may be found in the University of Wisconsin library system.

Doctoral dissertations and theses for the Master of Science degree are not included in this bibliography, nor are publications written by visiting faculty members.

Additional historical information about the Department of Rural Sociology, including names of staff members and dates of service, can be found in Early History of the Department of Rural Sociology by Arthur F. Wileden, available from the department.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Professor Emeritus Arthur Wileden compiled the early entries for this bibliography, particularly the bulletins and other published reports. More recent entries were added by Amy Glynn and Eleanor Cautley with Professor Glenn Fuguitt.

Books

Barton, John R.
1948 Rural Artists of Wisconsin. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Brunner, Edmund de S. and John H. Kolb
1933 Rural Social Trends. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Buttel, Frederick H. and Howard Newby (editors)
1980 The Rural Sociology of the Advanced Socities: Critical Perspectives. New Jersey: Allenheld Osman.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, David L. Featherman, and Beverly Duncan
1972 Socioeconomic Background and Achievement. New York: Seminar Press.

Featherman, David L. and Robert M. Hauser
1977 The Process of Stratification: Trends and Analyses. New York: Academic Press.

1978 Opportunity and Change. New York: Academic Press.

Galpin, Charles J.
1918 Rural Life. New York: The Century Company.

1938 My Drift Into Rural Sociology. University, La.: Louisiana State University Press.

Haller, Archibald O. and Irwin W. Miller
1971 The Occupational Aspiration Scale. Second edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman.

Havens, A. Eugene
1966 Tamesis: Estructura y Cambio. Bogota: Tercer Mundo.

1976 Hacia un Analisis de la Estructura Agraria Peruana: Apuntes Metodologicos. Lima: PUCP.

Havens, A. Eugene and William L. Flinn (editors)
1970 Internal Colonialism and Structural Change in Colombia. New York: Praeger.

Havens, A. Eugene, Eduardo Montero, and Michel Romieux
1965 Cerete, Un Area de Latifundo: Estudio Economico y Social. Bogota: Facultad de Sociologia.

Havens, A. Eugene and Teresa Ore
1975 Metodo en el Materialismo Historico y Ciencias Sociales. Lima: PUCP.

Havens, A. Eugene, Rodrigo Parra, and William L. Flinn
1977 Metodologia y Desarrollo en las Ciencias Sociales. Bogota: Uniandes.

Havens, A. Eugene, Everett M. Rogers and Aaron Lipman
1965 Medicion en la Sociologia. Bogota: Ediciones Facultad de Sociologia.

Havens, A. Eugene and Michel Romieux
1966 Barrancabermeja: Conflictos Sociales en Torno a un Centro Petrolero. Bogota: Tercer Mundo.

Hill, George W. and Ronald A. Smith
1939 Relief Trends in Wisconsin from 1934 to 1937. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kolb, John H.
1959 Emerging Rural Communities. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kolb, John H. and Edmund de S. Brunner
1935 A Study of Rural Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. (Revised 1940; 3rd edition 1946; 4th edition 1952; reprinted 1971, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press).

Leal, Francisco, A. Eugene Havens and others
1976 El Agro en el Desarrollo Historico Colombiano. Bogota: Pienta de Lanza.

Newby, Howard
1980 Social Change in Rural England. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Sanders, H.C. (ed.) and Robert C. Clark (assoc. ed.)
1966 The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sewell, William H., Robert M. Hauser, and David L. Featherman (editors)
1976 Schooling and Achievement in American Society. New York: Academic Press.

Smith, Eldon and Gene F. Summers
1978 How New Industry Affects Rural Communities. Mississippi State, Miss.: Southern Rural Development Center.

Summers, Gene F. (editor)
1970 Attitude Measurement. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Summers, Gene F., Sharon Evans, Frank Clemente, Jon Minkoff, and E.M. Beck, Jr.
1976 Industrial Invasion of Nonmetropolitan America. New York: Praeger.

Summers, Gene F. and Arne Selvik (editors)
1979 Nonmetropolitan Industrial Growth and Community Change. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

Usandizago, Elsa and A. Eugene Havens
1966 Tres Barrios de Invasion. Bogota: Tercer Mundo.

Wileden, Arthur F.
1962 Forty Years of Cooperative Extension in Wisconsin. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

1970 Community Development: The Dynamics of Planned Change. Totowa, NJ: Bedminster Press.

Chapters in Books, Bulletins and Proceedings

Adams, D.W. and A.E. Havens
1969 "The Use of Socio-economic Research in Developing a Strategy of Change." In Barbara A. Benedict and others (eds.) Strategies for Social Intervention. New York: The Free Press.

Beale, Calvin L., and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1978 "The New Pattern of Nonmetropolitan Population Change." Pp. 157-177 in Karl E. Taeuber, Larry L. Bumpass, and James A. Sweet (eds.) Social Demography. New York: Academic Press.

Beck, E.M., and Gene F. Summers
1979 "Additive, Multiplicative, and Mixed Models for Studying Community Change." Pp. 255-263 in G.F. Summers and Arne Selvik (eds.) Nonmetropolitan Industrial Growth and Community Change. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

Bultena, Gordon
1965 "Values in Outdoor Recreation: A Problem of Quantity and Quality." Pp.32-37 in Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Forestry and Forest Recreation Land Use. Madison, Wisconsin.

Buttel, Frederick H., and William L. Flinn
1974 "The Change in Structure of the Environment Movement, 1968-1973." In Arvin Murch (ed.) Who Cares about the Environment: The Origins and Sources of Environmental Concern. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press.

Chenaut, Maria V. and Paul R. Voss
1980 "Determinants of Community Satisfaction Among Recent Nonmetropolitan Migrants." In Robert P. Wolensky and Edward J. Miller, eds. The Small City and Regional Community. Stevens Point, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.

Dotson, Louis E. and Gene F. Summers
1970 "Elaboration of Guttman Scaling Techniques." In G.F. Summers (ed.) Attitude Measurement. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Featherman, David L.
1970 "Marital Fertility and the Process of Socioeconomic Achievement: An Examination of the Mobility Hypothesis." Pp. 104-131 in L. Bumpass and C. Westoff, The Later Years of Childbearing. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1979 "Schooling and Occupational Careers: Constancy and Change in Worldly Success." In O. Brim and J. Kagan (eds.), Constancy and Change in Human Development. Harvard University.

Featherman, David L., W.T. Bielby, and R.M. Hauser
1977 "Response Errors of Nonblack Males in Models of the Stratification Process." In A.S. Goldberger and D.J. Aigner (eds.), Latent Variables in Socioeconomic Models. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Featherman, David L., and T. Michael Carter
1975 "Discontinuities in Schooling and the Socioeconomic Life Cycle." Pp. 133-160 in W.H. Sewell, R.M. Hauser, and D.L. Featherman (eds.) Schooling and Achievement in American Society. New York: Academic Press.

Featherman, David L. and O.D. Duncan
1973 "Psychological and Cultural Factors in the Process of Occupation Achievement." In A. Goldberger and O.D. Duncan (eds.), Structural Equation Models in the Social Sciences. New York: Seminar.

Featherman, David L., and Robert M. Hauser
1975 "Design for a Replicate Study of Social Mobility in the United States." Pp. 219-251 in K. Land and S. Spilerman (eds.) Social Indicator Models. New York: Russell Sage.

Featherman, David L., F.L. Jones, and R.M. Hauser
1977 "Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U.S.: The Case of Occupational Status." In W. Wesolowski (ed.), Social Mobility in Comparative Perspective. Warsaw: Ossolineum.

Featherman, David L., and K. Spenner
1978 "Achievement Ambitions." In The Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 4. Palo Alto, Cal.: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Fuguitt, Glenn V.
1962 "The Rural-Urban Fringe." Pp. 88-98 in Proceedings of American Country Life Association.

1968 "Some Characteristics of Villages in Rural America." Pp. 51-73 in Rural Poverty in the United States. A Report by the President's Commission on Rural Poverty. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1971 "White and Nonwhite Population Characteristics of Growing and Declining Cities in the Nonmetropolitan South." Proceedings of the Rural Sociology Section, Association of Southern Agricultural Workers Annual Meeting, 1971. State College: Department of Sociology and Rural Life, Mississippi State University.

1972 "Population Redistribution in the West North Central States" Pp. 11-20 in Seminar Papers, Rural Community Development Seminar: Focus on Iowa. Ames: The Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University.

1972 "Population Trends of Nonmetropolitan Cities and Villages of the United States." Pp. 109-126 in U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; Population, Distribution, and Policy. Sara Mills Mazie (ed.) Vol. V of Commission research reports. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1978 "Population Trends of Cities and Villages in the North Central States." Pp. 4-13 in J. Allan Beegle and Robert L. McNamara (eds.) Patterns of Migration and Population Change in Americas Heartland. East Lansing: Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report 344 (April).

1979 "City and Village Population Trends in the Plains States." Pp. 225-243 in Brian W. Blouet and Frederick C. Luebke (eds.) The Great Plains Environment and Culture. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Fuguitt, Glenn V., and Calvin L. Beale
1977 "Recent Trends in City Population Growth and Distribution." Pp. 13-27 in Herrington J. Bryce (ed.) Small Cities in Transition: The Dynamics of Growth and Decline. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.

1978 "Post-1970 Shifts in the Pattern of Population Change in the North Central Region." Pp. 14-11 in J. Allan Beegle and Robert L. McNamara (eds.) Patterns of Migration and Population Change in America's Heartland. East Lansing: Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report 344 (April).

Fuguitt, Glenn V., Donald E. Johnson and Ivo A. Schneider
1972 "Crecimiento Urbano en Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil (1950-1960)." Pp. 591-598 in Conferencia Regional Latinoamericana de Poblacion, Actas 1. Mexico, D.F.: El Colegio de Mexico.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and Stanley Lieberson
1974 "The Correlation of Ratios or Difference Scores Having Common Terms." Pp. 128-144 in Herbert L. Costner (ed.) Sociological Methodology 1973-1974. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fuguitt, Glenn V., and Paul R. Voss
1979 "Recent Nonmetropolitan Population Trends." Pp. 1-49 in Growth and Change in Rural America. Management and Control of Growth Series. Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute.

Haller, Archibald O.
1968 "Education and the Occupational Achievement Process." Pp. 149-169 in President's National Advisory Council on Rural Poverty, Rural Poverty in the United States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1970 "Recent Changes in Rural Stratification in Rio de Janeiro." Pp. 191-204 in C.C. Zimmerman and R.E. DeWors (eds.), Sociology of Under-development. Toronto: Copp-Clark Co.

1971 "What Constitutes Quality of Living?" Pp. 3-7 in Quality of Rural Living: Proceedings of the Workshop on Quality of Rural Living. Washington, D.C.: The National Research Council.

1972 "Structural Changes in Status Stratification Systems." Pp. 79-93 in Community and Human Resource Development in the West: Report No. 1. Conference Proceedings of the Committee on Community and Human Resource Development of the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University.

1973 "Observacoes Sobre Sociologia Contemporanea." Pp. 26-38 in Juan Diaz Bordenave, ed., Ensenza e Investigacion en Sociologia Rural en America Latina. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Inter-Americano de Ciencias Agricolas.

1976 "The Land Report." Pp. 63-103 in H.R. Harvey, A.O. Haller, C.D. Palit, and A. Strickon, Defendant's Rebuttal Report: Helen Mitchell vs. the United States. Docket , United States Court of Claims, Washington, D.C.

Havens, A. Eugene
1963 "La Adopcion de Innovaciones: Una Comparacion entre Colombia y Los Estados Unidos." Pp. 92-112 in Memoria del Primer Congreso Nacional de Sociologia. Bogota: Associacion Colombiana de Sociologia.

1964 "Conflicto de Roles y Cambio Social en la Administracion Publica." Pp. 81-92 in Primer Seminario de Administracion Publica en los Paises de Desarrollo. Bogota: Escuela Superior de Administracion Publica.

1969 "The Quest for Societal Development." In George Beal (ed.), The Sociology of Development. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

1969 "Social Factors in Economic Development." In Timothy Wallace and Daryl Hobbs, Community Resource Development. Durham: North Carolina University Press.

1972 "Cambio Estructural y Conflicto de Roles en la Administracion Publica del Sector Agrario." In Francisco Oliart (ed.) La Administracion en el Processo del Desarrollo. Mexico: Siglo XXI.

1974 "The Diffusion of New Seed Varieties and Its Consequences: The Colombian Case." In Raymond Dumett and Lawrence Brainard (eds.), Problems in Rural Development: Case Studies and Multidisciplinary Perspectives. Lieden, The Netherlands: E.J. Brill Press.

1975 "Introduction." In Juan de la Cruz Gomez, Reforma Agraria y Campesinado de Caylloma. Arequipa, Peru: Editorial Universitaria.

1976 "Materialismo Historico y Relaciones de Produccion en el Agro Colombiano." In Francisco Leal et al., El Agro en el Desarrollo Historico Colombiano. Bogota: Pienta de Lanza.

1979 "Class Analysis: An Alternative Approach to the Study of Development." Chapter 2 in Billie DeWalt (ed.) Social Sciences in the Planning Process. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

1979 "The Organization of Work and Technological Change in Syrian Villages." Chapter 3 in David Stanfield (ed.) An Assessment of Human Resources for Rural Development in the Syrian Arab Republic. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

1980 "Transformacion de la Agricultura: Acumulacion de Capital y el Estado." In Roger Bartra (ed.) El Estado en el Capitalismo Contemporaneo. Mexico: Siglo XXI.

Havens, A. Eugene and William L. Flinn
1974 "Green Revolution Technology: Structural Aspects of Its Adoption and Consequences." In Andrew Pearse (ed.), Social and Economic Aspects of New Food Producing Varieties. Geneva: United Nations.

1976 "Anomie and Authoritarianism in Five Colombian Cities." In Wayne A. Cornelium and E.M. Trueblood (eds.), Urbanism and Social Change. California: Sage Publications.

Havens, A. Eugene, William Flinn, and Susana Lastarria-Corneill
1980 "Agrarian Reform and the National Front: A Class Analysis." Pp. 341-379 in R. Albert Berry et al. (eds.) Politics of Compromise: Coalition Government in Colombia. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Havens, A. Eugene, Susana Lastarria and William Flinn
1980 "Agrarian Reform and the National Front." In Al Berry (ed.) Politics of Compromise. New York: Transaction Books.

Havens, A. Eugene, Susana Lastarria and Gerardo Otero
1980 "Rural Classes and Agrarian Reform in Peru." In David Booth (ed.) Military Reformism and Social Classes. London: Macmillan.

Havens, A. Eugene, and David Stanfield
1979 "Executive Summary." Volume 1 in An Assessment of Human Resources for Rural Development in the Syrian Arab Republic. Washington, D.C.: USDA (July).

Havens, A. Eugene and others
1964 "Grupos de Presion y la Reforma Agraria." Pp. 5-14 in Primer Seminario de Reforma Agraria. Bogota: Editora Continente, Ltda.

Heaton, Tim B., and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1979 "Nonmetropolitan Industrial Growth and Net Migration." Pp. 119-136 in Richard E. Lonsdale and H.L. Seyler (eds.) Nonmetropolitan Industrialization. Washington, D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.

Heberlein, Thomas A.
1971 "A Causal Assessment of Validity: The Augmented Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix." In H.M. Blalock, Jr. (ed.) Causal Models in the Social Sciences. Aldine Publishers.

1974 "Some Limitations of Social Science Research for Policy Application." In M. Powell and Dalton McFarland (eds.) Management Problems in Social Policy Application. New York: The Institute for Administrative Research and Ohio State University.

1974 "Methodological Strategies for Evaluating the Effect of Water Resources on Social Well-Being and Quality of Life." In W.E. Andrews, R.T. Burdge, H.R. Capener, W.K. Warner and K.P. Wilkinson (eds), The Social Well-Being and Quality of Life Dimension in Water Resources Planning and Development, Conference proceedings. Logan: Utah State University.

1974 "The Three Fixes: Technological, Cognitive and Structural." In Donald Field, James C. Barren and Burl F. Long(eds.) Water and Community Development: Social and Economic Perspectives. Ann Arbor: Science Publishers, Inc.

1977 "Density, Crowding and Satisfaction: Sociological Studies for Determining Carrying Capacity." In Proceedings of the River Recreation Management and Research Symposium, USDA General Technical Report NC-28.

Johnson, Donald E.
1963 "The Departmental Role of the Extension Specialist." In Role of Rural Sociologists, Proceedings of the Regional Seminar on Resource Development, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Publication MM-236. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.

1972 "Consensus Approaches to Social Change." In The Proceedings of the Annual Cooperative Extension Conference. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

1973 "Sociological Profiles of Low Income Farm Families." In the Proceedings of the North Central Farm Management Extension Workshop. East Lansing: Michigan State University (May).

1978 "Overview of Issues: The Quality of Life." Pp. 46-52 in Peter W. Amato (ed.) Farmland Preservation Planning. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Johnson, Donald E., and A.E. Sturm
1978 "A Reassessment of Ethnic Origin as an Explanation of Variance in Innovativeness in a Remote Brazilian Municipio." Pp. 49-64 in Jose Marques de Melo (ed.) Mass Communication and Diffusion of Innovations in Brazil. Petropolis, Brazil: Editora Vozes Ltda.

Johnson, Donald E. and W. Keith Warner
1966 "Improving Organizational Effectiveness in Community Resource Development Programs." Pp. 79-100 in Proceedings of Second National Extension Workshop in Community Resource Development. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

1971 "Motivating Change in Cooperatives" (Chapter 10) and W.K. Warner and D.E. Johnson "Motivating Membership Involvement in Cooperatives" (Chapter 11). In Frank Groves and Richard Vilstrup (eds.) Cooperative Communications - Techniques. University Extension, Cooperative Extension Programs.

Johnson, D.E., et al.
1970 "Applied Sociological Research on Farmers' Organizations and Farmers' Movements." In Denton E. Morrison (ed.) Farmers' Organizations and Movements. North Central Regional Research Publication No. 200, Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 24, East Lansing.

Kolb, John H.
1933 "Rural Life." Chapter X in Recent Social Trends in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Lieberson, Stanley and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1970 "Negro-White Occupational Differences in the Absence of Discrimination." Pp. 284-295 in Marcel L. Goldschmid (ed.) Black Americans and White Racism. New York: Holt, Rinehardt and Winston.

Marshall, Douglas G.
1961 "Nature and Role of Mobility in Modern Society." In Conference on Labor Mobility and Population in America. Ames: Iowa State University.

1962 "Older People in Rural Development Areas in Wisconsin." In Eleventh Annual Southern Conference on Gerontology. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press.

1965 "Migration and Older People in a Rural Community: The Story of Price County, Wisconsin." Chapter 21 in Arnold M. Rose and Warren A. Peterson, Older People and Their Social World. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Co.

Pastore, Jose, Archibald O. Haller, and Hernando Gomez Buendia
1977 "Training, Position, and Experience in the Wage Rates of Specialized Personnel in Sao Paul's Manufacturing Firms." Pp. 158-169 in Subbiah Kannappan (eds.) Studies of Urban Labour Market Behavior in Developing Areas. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Scott, John T. Jr. and Gene F. Summers
1974 "Problems in Rural Communities after Industry Arrives." Pp. 94-107 in Larry Whiting (ed.) Rural Industrialization: Problems and Potentials. Ames, Iowa: North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Iowa State University Press.

Sewell, William H.
1946 "Rural Health: The Health of Farm Families in Relation to Their Socioeconomic Status." Pp. 135-137 in O.D. Duncan, Social Research on Health. New York: Social Science Research Council.

1947 "The Direct Effects of Bombing," Ch. 4, pp. 33-42; "The Influence of Bombing Experience on Morale," Ch. 5, pp. 43-59; "The Morale Index," Appendix K, pp. 201-204; "The Confidence in Victory Index," Appendix L, pp. 205-206; "The Urban Bombing Strata," Appendix M, pp. 206-207; "Sample Interviews," Appendix O, pp. 213-216; "Patterns of Cleavage," Appendix R, pp. 224-225; in The Effects of U.S. Strategic Bombing on Japanese Civilian Morale, Pacific War Series No. 14, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

1947 "New Factors to be Considered in Extension Programs for Youth." Pp. 7-12 in Report of the Central States Older Youth Workshop, U.S.D.A.

1959 "Social Trends in the Decade Ahead." Pp. 1-24 in Proceedings of the 1959 Meeting of the Public Relations Society of America. Madison, Wis.

1960 "Rural-urban Differences in Ability and Aspirations." Pp. 1-37 in Proceedings of the Conference on Psychological Factors in the Development of Abilities. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

1963 "The Educational and Occupational Perspectives of Rural Youth." Pp. 1-27 in Proceedings of the National Conference on Problems of Rural Youth in a Changing Environment. Washington, DC: The National Committee for Children and Youth.

Slesinger, Doris P.
1976 "The Utilization of Preventive Medical Services by Urban Black Mothers." Pp. 197-219 in D. Mechanic, The Growing Bureaucratization of Medical Care. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Summers, Gene F.
1974 "Some Comments on Rural Development Models and Concepts." Pp. 186-188 in Wade H. Andrews et al. (ed.) The Social Well-Being and Quality of Life Dimension in Water Resources Planning and Development. Logan, Utah: Institute for Social Science Research on Natural Resources, Utah State University.

1976 "Social Attitudes and Values Associated with Foreign Investment and Occupation of U.S. Land." Pp. 59-72 in Gene Wunderlich (ed.) Foreign Investment in U.S. Real Estate. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

1979 "Manufacturing and Rural Development." Pp. 24-32 in Eldon Smith (ed.) Rural Industrialization. Mississippi State: Southern Rural Development Center.

Summers, Gene F., E.M. Beck, and C. Matthew Snipp
1979 "Coping with Industrialization." Pp. 161-178 in Richard Lonsdale and H.L. Seyler (eds.) Nonmetropolitan Industrialization. Washington, D.C.: V.H. Winston and Sons.

Summers, Gene F., Frank Clemente, Ronald Schaffer, and James L. Moore
1973 "Social and Economic Effects of Industrial Development." Pp. 38-47 in James L. Moore (ed.), Information, Methods and Procedures for the Evaluation of the Environmental Effects of Industrial Development. Madison: University of Wisconsin, School of Natural Resources.

Summers, Gene F., Lauren H. Seiler and Glenn Wiley
1970 "A Note on the Validation on Reputational Leadership by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix." In E.F. Borgatta and G.W. Bohrnstedt (eds.), Sociological Methodology 1970. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tienda, Marta, and Osei Mensah Aborampah
1980 "Poverty Status, Tenure Status and Energy Related Adaptations Among Nonmetropolitan Wisconsin Households: A Discriminant Analysis." In Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference on Small City and Regional Community. Stevens Point, Wis.: University of Wisconsin.

Tordella, Stephen
1979 "Fertility Differentials in Wisconsin, 1960-1975." Pp. 87-117 in Doris P. Slesinger and Paul R. Voss (eds.) Recent Trends in Wisconsin's Population. Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Voss, Paul R.
1976 "Population Data in Social Science Data Archives: the survey holdings of the Roper Public Opinion Research Center." In Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Conference of the Association for Population Family Planning Libraries and Information Centers.

1979 "Breaks with the Past: ties to former communities among recent migrants to the Upper Great Lakes region." In Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on Small City and Regional Community, Stevens Point, Wis., March 15, 1979. Stevens Point: University of Wisconsin.

1979 "An Experiment in Small-area Population Forecasting." In Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, 139th Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association.

1980 "Rural Population Dynamics." Pp. 23-45 in David Fodroczi (ed.), Current Issues in Farmland Preservation Planning. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Voss, Paul R., and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1978 "Characteristics of Recent Migrants to Wisconsin's North Country." Pp. 118-140 in Doris P. Slesinger and Paul R. Voss (eds.) Recent Trends in Wisconsin's Population. Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Voss, Paul R., et al.
1980 "An Investigation of the Performance of Simple Time Series Models to the Forecasting of Human Population." In Proceedings of the Social Statistics Session, American Statistical Association.

Warner, W. Keith
1964 "Some Processes and Problems of Decision Making." Pp. 24-28 in The Role of the Church in Community Economic Development, Report of the 1964 Town and Country Pastors Conference. Madison: Cooperative Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

1967 "Issues in Relating Ideas to Action." Pp. 89-98 in Robert D. Boyd (ed.) Changing Concepts of Productive Living. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Extension.

1970 "Some Needs in Farm Organization Research." Pp. 11-22 in Denton E. Morrison (ed.) Farmers Organizations and Movements: Research Needs and a Bibliography of the United States and Canada. East Lansing: Michigan State University, North Central Regional Research Publication No. 200.

1971 "Structural Matrix of Development." Chapter 4 (pp. 94-115) in George M. Beal, Ronald C. Powers, and E. Walter Coward, Jr. (eds.) Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Wheaton, R. Blair, Bengt Muthen, Duane F. Alwin, and Gene F. Summers
1977 "Assessing Reliability and Stability in Panel Models." Pp. 84-136 in David R. Heise (ed.) Sociological Methodology 1977. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wileden, Arthur F.
1932 "Participation in the Cultural Arts." In Proceedings of the American Country Life Association.

1948 "Recreation Trends in the Rural Community." Pp. 160-168 in Proceedings of 30th National Congress, National Recreation Association.

1953 "How to Use Community Surveys." Chapter in Making Good Communities Better. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

1957 "The New Rural Society: Price and Rewards of Progress." Presidential Address in Proceedings of the American Country Life Association.

1958 "A New Look at Our Changing Rural Society." In Proceedings of 13th National Conference on Rural Health, American Medical Association.

1960 "Emerging Patterns of American Rural Life." Pp. 8-15 in Golden Horizons. Prebyterian Church, USA.

1961 "Continuing Education and Country Life." Pp. 74-76 in Proceedings of the American Country Life Association.

1962 "Cooperative Extension: A Case Illustration of Institutional Adjustment to Change." In 22nd Proceedings of the American Country Life Association.

Wileden, Arthur F. and John F. Ross
1963 "Communication: A Matter of Understanding." Chapter in USDA Yearbook, A Place to Live. Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture.

Wilkening, Eugene A.
1958 "Communication and Technological Change in Rural Society" and "The Process of Acceptance of Innovations in Rural Society." In A.L. Bertrand (ed.) Rural Sociology. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

1962 "The Communication of Information on Innovations in Agriculture." In Wilbur Schramm (ed.) Studies of Innovation and Communication to the Public. Palo Alto, Calif.: Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University.

1964 "The Selection, Definition and Conceptualization of the Problems of Studies in Communications." In Delbert Myren (ed.) Report of the First Inter-American Symposium on the Role of Information in Agricultural Development. Mexico City.

1965 "Rural Sociology." 2500 word article in Encyclopedia Britannica. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica.

1970 "Some Problems of Development in the Central Plateau of Brazil." In Carle C. Zimmerman and Richard E. DuWors (eds.) Sociology of Underdevelopment. Toronto, Ontario: Copp Clark Publishing Co.

Wilkening, Eugene A., and Lowell Klessig
1978 "The Rural Environment: Quality and Conflicts in Land Use." Pp. 19-34 in Thomas R. Ford (ed.) Rural Society in the United States. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Zuiches, James J. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1972 "Residential Preferences: Implications for Population Redistribution in Nonmetropolitan Areas." Pp. 617-630 in U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; Population, Distribution, and Policy. Sara Mills Mazie (ed.) Vol. V of Commission research reports. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Journal Articles

Banchero, Lawrence and William L. Flinn
1967 "The application of sociological techniques to the study of college slang." American Speech 42 (February): 51-57.

Beale, Calvin L. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1978 "Population trends in nonmetropolitan cities and villages in subregions of the United States." Demography 15 (November): 605-620.

Beck, E.M., Louis E. Dotson and Gene F. Summers
1973 "Effects of industrial development on heads of households." Growth and Change 4 (July): 16-19.

Beers, Howard W. and J.H. Kolb
1946 "Group classification: Dwight Sanderson's contribution." Rural Sociology 11 (March): 23-35.

Bharadwaj, Lakshmi and Eugene A. Wilkening
1977 "Predicting perceived well-being." Social Indicators Research 4: 421-439.

1979 "Life domain predictors of satisfaction with personal efficacy." Human Relations 33: 165-181.

1980 "Life domain satisfactions and personal social integration." Social Indicators Research 7: 337-351.

Bielby, William T., Robert M. Hauser, and David L. Featherman
1977 "Response errors of black and nonblack males in models of the intergenerational transmission of socioeconomic status." American Journal of Sociology (May): 1242-1288.

1977 "Response errors of nonblack males in models of the stratification process." Journal of the American Statistical Association 72 (December): 723-735.

Bishop, Richard C. and Thomas A. Heberlein
1979 "Measuring values of extra market goods: are indirect measures biased?" American Journal of Agricultural Economics 61 (December): 926-930.

Brown, David L. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1972 "Percent nonwhite and racial disparity in nonmetropolitan cities of the South." Social Science Quarterly 53 (December): 573-582.

Brunner, Edmund deS., J.H. Kolb, et al.
1945 "Report of the committee on post-war recruitment and training of the Rural Sociology Society." Rural Sociology 10 (March): 76-85.

Bultena, Gordon
1968 "Age-grading in the social interaction of an elderly male population." Journal of Gerontology 23 (October): 539-543.

1969 "Career mobility among low-income farm operators." Rural Sociology 34 (December): 563-569.

1969 "Health patterns of aged migrants." Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 17 (December): 1127-1131.

1969 "The relationship of occupation status to friendship ties in three planned retirement communities." Journal of Gerontology 24: 461-464.

1969 "Life continuity and morale in old age." The Gerontologist 9 (Winter): 251-253.

1969 "Rural-urban differences in the familial interaction of the aged." Rural Sociology 34 (March): 5-15.

Bultena, Gordon and Lowell Klessig
1969 "Satisfaction in camping: a conceptualization and guide to social research." Journal of Leisure Research 1 (Autumn): 348-354.

Bultena, Gordon and Douglas Marshall
1970 "Family patterns of migrant and nonmigrant retirees." Journal of Marriage and the Family (February): 89-93.

Bultena, Gordon and Vivian Wood
1969 "The American retirement community: bane or blessing?" Journal of Gerontology 24 (April).

1969 "Normative attitudes toward the aged role among migrant and nonmigrant retirees." The Gerontologist 9 (Autumn): 204-208.

1970 "Leisure orientation and recreational activities of retirement-community residents." Journal of Leisure Research 2 (Winter): 3-15.

Butler, James E. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1970 "Small town population change and distance from larger towns: a replication of Hassinger's study." Rural Sociology 35 (September): 396-409.

Buttel, Frederick H. and William L. Flinn
1975 "Sources and consequences of agrarian values in American society." Rural Sociology 40 (Summer): 134-151.

1975 "Methodological issues in the sociology of natural resources." Humboldt Journal of Social Sciences 3 (Fall, Winter): 62-72.

Buttel, Frederick H. and Donald E. Johnson
1977 "Support for liberal development policies among community elites in a rural region of Wisconsin." Land Economics 53 (November): 455-467.

1977 "Dimensions of environmental concern: factor structure, correlates, and implications for research." The Journal of Environmental Education 9 (Winter): 49-64.

Buttel, Frederick H., Oscar B. Martinson, and Euguene A. Wilkening
1979 "Size of place and community attachment: a reconsideration." Social Indicators Research 6: 475-485.

Cartano, David G. and William L. Flinn
1970 "Comparacion de dos correlentes de migracion en Colombia." Desarrollo Rural en las Americas 11 (January-April): 48-53.

Clark, Robert C.
1959 "Research within selected programs of the Cooperative Extension Service." Review of Educational Research 29 (June).

1959 "Organization and administration of the Cooperative Extension Service." Review of Educational Research (June).

1965 "Extension education as a profession." Indian Journal of Extension Education 1(1), published by The Indian Society of Extension Education (April).

1966 "Agricultural extension as a profession." The Nigerian Agricultural Journal 3 (October).

1967 "Professional development of extension officers." Bulletin of Rural Economics and Sociology 2(2), University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

1967 "Basic principles of effective coordination." Administration 2(1), Quarterly Review of the Institute of Administration, University of Ife, Ibadan, Nigeria (October).

Clark, Robert C. and Fawzi M. Abdullah
1964 "County chairman position." Journal of Cooperative Extension 2 (Fall).

Clemente, Frank and Gene F. Summers

1973 "A comment on Palmore and Whittington's relative status of the aged." Social Forces 51 (June): 494-495.

1973 "Industrial development and the elderly: a longitudinal analysis." Journal of Gerontology 28 (October): 479-483.

1974 "Age and the journey to work." The Gerontologist 14 (June).

1975 "The journey to work of rural industrial employees: a test of the metropolitan model of commuting." Social Forces 54 (September): 212-219.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, Archibald O. Haller and Alejandro Portes

1968 "Peer influences on aspiration: a reinterpretation." American Journal of Sociology 74 (September): 119-137.

Featherman, David L.

1971 "The socioeconomic achievement of white religio-ethnic subgroups: social and psychological explanations." American Sociological Review 36 (April): 207-222.

1971 "Residential background and socioeconomic achievements in metropolitan stratification systems." Rural Sociology 36 (June): 107-124.

1971 "A social structural model for the socioeconomic career." American Journal of Sociology 77 (September): 293-304.

1972 "Achievement orientations and socioeconomic career attainments." American Sociological Review 37 (April): 131-143.

1973 "Comments on models for the socioeconomic career." American Sociological Review 38 (December): 785-790.

1979 "Opportunities are expanding." Transaction/Society 4 (March/April).

Featherman, D.L., M. Boyd and J. Matras

1979 "Status attainment of immigrant and immigrant-origin groups in the United States, Canada, and Israel." Comparative Studies in Sociology 3.

Featherman, D.L. and O.D. Duncan

1972 "Psychological and cultural factors in the process of occupational achievements." Social Science Research 1 (June): 121-145.

Featherman, D.L. and Robert M. Hauser
1973 "On the measurement of occupation in social surveys." Sociological Methods and Research 2 (November): 239-251.

1976 "Prestige or socioeconomic scales in the study of occupational achievement?" Sociological Methods and Research 4 (May): 403-422.

1976 "Changes in the socioeconomic stratification of the races, 1962-1973." American Journal of Sociology 82 (November): 621-651.

Featherman, D.L., R.M. Hauser, and W.H. Sewell
1974 "Toward comparable data on inequality and stratification: perspectives on the second generation of mobility studies." The American Sociologist 9 (February): 18-25.

Featherman, D.L., F. Lancaster Jones, and Robert M. Hauser
1975 "Assumptions of social mobility research in the United States." Social Science Research 4 (December): 329-360.

Field, Donald R., Carl R. Frederickson and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1973 "The Rural Sociological Society: a membership profile." Rural Sociology 38 (Fall): 338-345.

Flinn, William L.
1968 "The process of migration to a shantytown in Bogota." Inter-American Economic Affairs 22 (Autumn): 77-88.

1970 "Influence of community values on innovativeness." American Journal of Sociology 75 (May): 983-991.

1973 "Apuntes sobre la familia en algunos barrios de Bogota." Razon y Fabula 32 (April-June): 1-33.

Flinn, William L. and Alvaro Camacho
1969 "The correlates of voter participation in a shantytown barrio in Bogota, Colombia." Inter-American Economic Affairs 22 (Spring): 47-58.

Flinn, William L. and David G. Cartano
1970 "A comparison of the migration process to an urban barrio and to a rural community: two case studies." Inter-American Economic Affairs 24 (Fall): 37-48.

Flinn, William L. and James W. Converse
1970 "Eight assumptions concerning rural-urban migration in Colombia: a three-shantytown test." Land Economics 46 (November): 456-466.

Flinn, William L. and Donald E. Johnson
1974 "Agrarianism among Wisconsin farmers." Rural Sociology 39: 187-204.

Fredrickson, Carl, Tim B. Heaton, Glenn V. Fuguitt and James J. Zuiches
1980 "Residential preferences in a model of migration intentions." Population and Environment 3 (Fall/Winter): 280-297.

Fuguitt, Glenn V.
1958 "Urban influence and the extent of part-time farming in a rural area." Rural Sociology 23 (December): 392-397.

1959 "Part-time farming and the push-pull hypothesis." American Journal of Sociology 64 (January): 375-379.

1961 "A typology of the part-time farmer." Rural Sociology 26 (March): 39-48.

1963 "The city and the countryside." Rural Sociology 28 (September): 246-261.

1965 "The small town in rural America." Journal of Cooperative Extension: 19-26.

1965 "Career patterns of part-time farmers and their contact with the Cooperative Extension Service." Rural Sociology 30 (March): 49-62.

1965 "Trends in unincorporated places, 1950-1960." Demography 2: 363-371.

1965 "County seat status as a factor in small town growth and decline." Social Forces 44 (December): 245-251.

1971 "The places left behind: population trends and policy for rural America." Rural Sociology 36 (December): 449-470.

1972 "Some demographic aspects of the small town in the United States." Sociologia Ruralis 7: 147-161.

1979 "Population movements and integrated rural development." Sociologia Ruralis 19 (No. 2/3): 99-115.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and Nora Ann Deeley
1966 "Retail service patterns and small town population change: a replication of Hassinger's study." Rural Sociology 31 (March): 53-63.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and Donald R. Field
1972 "Some population characteristics of villages differentiated by size, location, and growth." Demography 9 (May): 295-308.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and Donald W. Thomas
1966 "Small town growth in the United States: an analysis by size class and by place." Demography 3: 513-527.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and Stephen J. Tordella
1980 "Elderly net migration: The new trend of nonmetropolitan population change." Research on Aging 2 (June): 191-204.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and James J. Zuiches
1975 "Residential preferences and population distribution." Demography 12 (August): 491-504.

Galpin, Charles J.
1919 "Rural sociology: standardization of research." American Journal of Sociology 24: 303-310.

1923 "Rural life in American art." Social Forces 2 (November): 10-13.

Gans, Marjorie, Eugene A. Wilkening and Jose Pastore
1970 "A mulher e a modernizacao da familia brasileira." ("The women and modernization of Brazilian family"). Pesquisa e Planejamento 12 (October). Revista do Centro Regional de Pesquisas Educacionais, Prof. Queiroz Filho -- Sao Paulo.

Geisler, Charles C., Eugene A. Wilkening, and Oscar B. Martinson
1977 "Outdoor recreation and environmental concern: a restudy." Rural Sociology 42 (Summer): 241-249.

Gubert, Renzo and Gene F. Summers
1979 "Conviene industrializzare le aree rurali?" Economia Trentina 2(3): 47-61.

Haller, Archibald O.
1967 "Urban economic growth and changes in rural stratification: Rio de Janeiro, 1953-1962." America Latina 10 (October-December): 47-68.

1968 "On the concept of aspiration." Rural Sociology 33 (December): 484-487.

1970 "Changes in the structure of status systems." Rural Sociology 35 (December): 469-487.

1979 "Mutamento strutturale e societa tecnologica." Sociologia Urbana e Rurale 1 (Semester 1): 85-97.

Haller, Archibald O. (ed.)
1978 "Socioeconomic change in Brazil." Luso-Brazilian Review 15 (Winter): 149-313.

Haller, Archibald O. and David B. Bills
1979 "Occupational prestige hierarchies: theory and evidence." A review essay of D.J. Treiman, Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective. New York: Academic Press. Contemporary Sociology 8 (September): 721-734.

Haller, Archibald O. and Edgar F. Borgatta
1968 "Rural sociology in 1967." The American Sociologist (November): 289-290.

Haller, Archibald O., Donald B. Holsinger and Helcio U. Saraiva
1970 "A sociologist looks at Fletcher's situation ethics." Lutheran Scholar 28 (July): 86-90.

1972 "Variations in occupational prestige hierarchies: Brazilian data." American Journal of Sociology 77 (March): 941-956.

Haller, Archibald, Luther B. Otto, Robert F. Meier and George Ohlendorf
1974 "Level of occupational aspiration: an empirical analysis." American Sociological Review 39 (February): 113-121.

Haller, Archibald and Alejandro Portes
1973 "Status attainment processes." Sociology of Education 46 (Winter): 51-91.

Haller, Archibald O. and Helcio U. Saraiva
1972 "Status measurement and the variable discrimination hypothesis in an isolated Brazilian region." Rural Sociology 37 (September): 325-351.

Haller, Archibald O. and William H. Sewell
1967 "Occupational choices of Wisconsin farm boys." Rural Sociology 32 (March): 37-55.

Haller, Archibald O. and Kenneth I. Spenner
1977 "Occupational income differentiation in status attainment." Rural Sociology 42 (Winter): 517-535.

Haller, Archibald O. and Joseph Woelfel
1969 "Identifying significant others and measuring their expectations for a person." Revue Internationale de Sociologie 2:5:3 (September): 395-429.

1972 "Significant others and their expectations: concepts and instruments to measure interpersonal influence on status aspirations." Rural Sociology 37 (December): 591-621.

Hansen, David O. and Archibald O. Haller
1973 "Status attainment process of Costa Rican men in youth and early adulthood." Rural Sociology 38 (Fall): 269-282.

1977 "On Lin and Yaugers cross-national comparison of the process of occupational status achievement." American Journal of Sociology 82 (January): 854-857.

Hauser, Robert M. and David L. Featherman
1973 "Trends in the occupational mobility of U.S. men, 1962-1970." American Sociological Review 38 (June): 302-310.

1974 "White-nonwhite differentials in occupational mobility among men in the U.S., 1962-1972." Demography 11 (May): 247-265.

1974 "Socioeconomic achievements of U.S. men, 1962-1972." Science 185 (July): 325-331.

1976 "Equality of schooling: trends and prospects." Sociology of Education 49 (April): 99-120.

1978 "Occupations and social mobility in the United States." Sociological Microjournal 12, Fiche 62. Copenhagen: Sociological Institute.

Havens, A. Eugene
1964 "Methodological problems of sociological survey research in Colombia." America Latina (May): 87-95.

1965 "Increasing the effectiveness of predicting innovativeness." Rural Sociology (June): 150-165.

1968 "Adopcion de inovaciones agriculas en una communidad Colombiana." Desarrollo Economico (June): 81-89.

1969 "Latin American economic organization: some consequences of U.S. foreign policy." Desarrollo Rural en las Americas 1(1): 1-12.

1972 "Un modelo del subdesarrollo Latinoamericano." Desarrollo Rural en las Americas 3(2): 106-121.

1972 "Methodological issues in the study of development." Sociologia Ruralis XII(314): 252-272.

1975 "Metodologiczne problemy badania rozwoju Spolecnego." Roczniki Socjoloch Wsi 23: 25-48.

1975 "Approaches to rural development: theoretical praxis and program limitations." Ford Foundation Review 3.

1976 "Estructura agraria en America Latina: nuevas tendencias del desarrollo." Revista Mexicana de Sociologia (September): 189-238.

1980 "La derrota fue en Lima." Nariz del Diablo 2 (August): No. 6.

Havens, Eugene A. and Dale W. Adams
1966 "The use of socio-economic research in developing a strategy for change in rural communities: a Colombian example." Economic Development and Cultural Change (January): 204-216.

Havens, A. Eugene and William L. Flinn
1975 "Green revolution technology and community development: the limits of action programs." Economic Development and Cultural Change 23 (April): 469-481.

1975 "La tecnologia de la revolucion verde y el desarrollo de la comunidad." Desarrollo Rural en las Americas (June).

Havens, Eugene A. and Aaron Lipman
1965 "The Colombian violencia: an ex post facto experiment." Social Forces 44 (December): 238-245.

Havens, Eugene A. and Harry R. Potter
1967 "Conflict resolution and industry's propensity to strike: a test of the Kerr-Siegel hypothesis." Human Organization 26 (Fall): 126-131.

Heaton, Tim B., William B. Clifford and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1980 "Changing patterns of retirement migration." Research on Aging 2 (March): 93-104.

Heaton, Tim B., Carl Fredrickson, Glenn V. Fuguitt, and James J. Zuiches
1979 "Residential preferences, community satisfaction and the intention to move." Demography 16 (November): 565-573.

Heaton, Tim and Glenn Fuguitt
1980 "Trends in population redistribution in the U.S. since 1950." Social Science Quarterly 61 (December): 508-523.

Heaton, Tim B., Daniel Lichter, and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1979 "Trends in the selectivity of migration between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas: 1955-1975." Rural Sociology 44 (Winter): 645-666.

Heberlein, Thomas A.
1972 "The land ethic realized: Some social psychological explanations of changing environmental attitudes." Journal of Social Issues (December).

1973 "Social psychological assumptions of user attitude surveys: the case of the Wildernism scale." Journal of Leisure Research 5 (Summer): 3.

1975 "Conservation information, the energy crisis and electricity consumption in an apartment complex." Energy Systems and Policy 1(2): 105-117.

1976 "Some observations on alternative mechanisms for public involvement: the hearing, public opinion poll, the workshop and the quasi-experiment." The Natural Resources Journal 16 (1): 197-212.

1977 "Norm activation and environmental action: a reply to Dunlap and Van Liere." Journal of Social Issues 33 (3): 207-211.

1977 "Stalking the wild deer hunter." Wisconsin Natural Resources 1 (3): 4-7.

1978 "Hunters choice and other good ideas." Wisconsin Natural Resources 2 (November-December): 8-11.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Bob Baumgartner
1978 "Factors affecting response rates to mailed questionnaires: a quantitative analysis of the published literature." American Sociological Review 43 (August): 447-462.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Richard Bishop
1979 "Measuring values of extra market goods: are indirect measures biased?" American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 61 (December): 926-930.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Stan Black
1976 "Attitudinal specificity and the prediction of behavior in a field setting." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 33 (4): 474-479.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Peter Dunwiddie
1979 "Systematic observation of user levels, campsite selection, and visitor characteristics at a high mountain lake." Journal of Leisure Research.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Bo Shelby
1977 "Carrying capacity, values and the satisfaction model: a reply to Griest." Journal of Leisure Research 9 (2): 142-148.

Henkel, Ramon E. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1962 "Nonfarm occupational involvement and the visiting relationships of farm operators." Rural Sociology 27 (March): 53-63.

1966 "Nonfarm work and the social relations of farmers." Rural Sociology 31 (March): 80-88.

Hill, George W.
1941 "The use of the culture-area concept in social research." American Journal of Sociology 47 (July): 39-47.

1947 "Recent population changes in rural Wisconsin." Rural Sociology 12 (June): 169-172.

Hill, George W. and Gregorio Beltran
1952 "Land settlement in Venezuela: with especial reference to the Turen project." Rural Sociology 17 (September): 229-236.

Hill, George W. and Harold T. Christensen
1942 "Some cultural factors related to occupational mobility among Wisconsin farmers." Rural Sociology 7 (June): 192-200.

Hill, George W. and James D. Tarver
1951 "Indigenous fertility in the farm population of Wisconsin, 1848-1948." Rural Sociology 16 (December): 359-362.

Hogan, Dennis P. and David L. Featherman
1977 "Racial stratification and socioeconomic change in the American north and south." American Journal of Sociology 83 (July): 100-126.

Hotchkiss, Lawrence, Evans Curry, Archibald O. Haller, and Keith Widaman
1979 "The occupational aspiration scale: an evaluation and alternate form for females." Rural Sociology 44 (Spring): 95-118.

Johansen, Harley E. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1973 "Changing retail activity in Wisconsin villages: 1939-1954-1970." Rural Sociology 38 (Summer): 207-218.

1979 "Population growth and retail decline: conflicting effects of urban accessbility in American villages." Rural Sociology 44 (Spring): 24-38.

Johnson, Donald E.
1973 "Response to guerilla research." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science (November).

Johnson, Donald E. and D.E. Morrison
1960 "The significance of farm adjustment problems to sociology." Rural Sociology 25: 352-354.

Johnson, Donald E. and W. Keith Warner
1965 "Contemporary issues in rural sociology." The Wisconsin Sociologist 4 (Winter): 1-14.

Kayser, Brian D. and Gene F. Summers
1973 "The adequacy of student reports of parental SES characteristics." Sociological Methods and Research 1 (February): 303-315.

Kirkpatrick, E.L.
1932 "Reading interests of farm families." Social Forces 11 (December): 224-227.

1933 "Can standards of living be rated from observation?" American Journal of Sociology 39 (November): 360-367.

1935 "Some adjustments of farm families to emergencies." American Journal of Sociology 40 (January): 496-502.

1937 "Rating marginal homes from observation." Rural Sociology 2 (March): 51-58.

Kirkpatrick, E.L. and Agnes M. Boynton
1936 "Rural young people face their own situation." Rural Sociology 1 (June): 151-163.

Kirkpatrick, E.L. and Evelyn G. Tough
1931 "Comparison of two scales for measuring the cost or value of family living." American Journal of Sociology 37 (November): 424-434.

Klaff, Vivian and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1978 "Annexation as a factor in the growth of U.S. cities, 1950-1960 and 1960-1970." Demography 15 (February): 1-12.

Kolb, J.H.
1923 "A rural church conference program for town and country clergyman." Social Forces 1 (May): 437-439.

1923 "A study in rural community organization." American Journal of Sociology 29 (July): 34-41.

1925 "Next steps in rural social research." Social Forces 3 (March): 445.

1934 "Agriculture and rural life." American Journal of Sociology 39 (May): 787-799.

1938 "Social security as a function of society." Rural Sociology 3 (March): 11-19.

1948 "Dr. Galpin at Wisconsin." Rural Sociology 13 (June): 130-145.

Lichter, Daniel T. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1980 "Demographic response to transportation innovation: the case of the interstate highway." Social Forces 59 (December): 492-512.

Lieberson, Stanley and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1967 "Negro-white occupational differences in the absence of discrimination." American Journal of Sociology 73 (September): 188-200.

Lindstrom, D.E., B.L. Hummel, and A.F. Wileden
1942 "Activities and programs being carried on in the field of rural sociology extension." Rural Sociology 7 (September): 328-332.

Mackinnon, Neil J. and Gene F. Summers
1976 "Homogeneity and role consensus: a multivariate exploration in role analysis." Canadian Journal of Sociology 1: 439-462.

Marcum, John P. and Marta Tienda
1978 "Intergenerational occupational mobility among Mexican Americans: a canonical correlation analysis." Sociological Quarterly 19 (Summer): 439-449.

Marshall, Douglas and Marion Deininger
1955 "A study of land ownership by ethnic groups from frontier time to the present in a marginal farming area in Minnesota." Land Economics 31 (November): 4.

Marshall, Douglas, and Allan Orman
1956 "Wisconsin's future population." Wisconsin Academy Review 111 (Winter).

Marshall, Douglas G., W.H. Sewell, and A.O. Haller
1953 "Factors associated with high school attendence of Wisconsin farm youth." Rural Sociology 18 (September): 257-260.

Martinson, Oscar B., Eugene A. Wilkening, and Richard Rodefeld
1976 "Feelings of powerlessness and social isolation among large-scale farm personnel." Rural Sociology 41 (Winter): 452-471.

Miller, Sidney J. and W. Keith Warner
1963 "Trends in social participation." Journal of Cooperative Extension 1 (Fall): 176-182.

Morrison, Denton E. and W. Keith Warner
1971 "Correlates of farmers' attitudes toward public and private aspects of agricultural organization." Rural Sociology 36 (March): 5-19.

Morrison, Denton E. and Eugene A. Wilkening
1963 "A comparison of husbands' and wives' responses with respect to who makes farm and home decisions." Marriage and Family Living (August): 349-351.

Newby, Howard
1980 "Rural sociology - A trend report." Current Sociology 28 (1): 1-140.

Otto, Luther B. and David L. Featherman
1975 "Social structural and psychological antecedents of self-estrangement and powerlessness." American Sociological Review 40 (December): 701-719.

Otto, Luther B. and Archibald O. Haller
1979 "Evidence for a social psychological view of the status attainment process: four studies compared. " Social Forces 57 (March): 887-914.

Otto, Luther B., Archibald O. Haller, Robert F. Meier and George Ohlendorf
1974 "An empirical evaluation of a scale to measure occupational aspiration level." Journal of Vocational Behavior 5: 1-11.

Pastore, Jose and Archibald O. Haller
1977 "The socioeconomic status of the Brazilian labor force." Luso-Brazilian Review 14 (Summer): 1-28.

Pastore, Jose, Archibald O. Haller, and Hernando Gomez Buendia
1975 "Determinants of wage differentials in Sao Paulo's specialized industrial labor force." Industrial Relations 14 (October): 345-357.

Pastore, Jose, Archibald O. Haller, Tarcizio R. Quirino, and T. Michael Carter
1975 "Occupational wage differentials among university educated technical personnel in a developing economy." Journal of Vocational Behavior 7: 113-126.

Petras, James and A. Eugene Havens
1978 "Peru--revolution og reaktion." Kontakt 8 (1978-1979): 37-41.

1979 "La deflation aggrave les conflits de classe au Perou." Le Monde Diplomatique (February).

1979 "Economic crisis in Peru." Monthly Review (February): 38-58.

Portes, Alejandro, Archibald O. Haller and William H. Sewell
1968 "Professional-executive vs. farming as unique occupation choices." Rural Sociology 33 (June): 153-159.

Poston, Dudley L., David Alvirez, and Marta Tienda
1976 "Earnings differences between Anglo and Mexican American male workers in 1960 and 1970: changes in the 'cost' of being Mexican American." Social Science Quarterly 57: 617-631.

Rojek, Dean, Frank Clemente, and Gene F. Summers
1975 "Community satisfaction: a study of contentment with local services." Rural Sociology 40 (Summer): 177-192.

Seiler, Lauren H. and Gene F. Summers
1974 "Locating community boundaries: an integration of theory and empirical techniques." Sociological Methods and Research 2 (February): 259-280.

1974 "Toward an interpretation of items used in field studies of mental illness." Social Science and Medicine (August): 459-467.

1975 "Corporate involvement in community affairs." Sociological Quarterly 20 (Summer): 375-386.

Sewell, William H.
1949 "Field techniques in social psychological study in a rural community." American Sociological Review 14 (December): 718-725.

1950 "Needed research in rural sociology." Rural Sociology 15 (March): 115-130.

1950 "Difficulties in cooperative regional research." Midwest Sociologist 12 (Spring): 17.

1951 "Current sociological research in the midwest." Midwest Sociologist 14 (Fall): 7-15.

1952 "Determinacao de escalas do padrao de vida das familias ruralis." A Revista de Pesquisas Economico-Socialis 11 (March): 103-118.

1952 "Infant training and the personality of the child." American Journal of Sociology 58 (September): 150-159.

1952 "The effects of feeding, weaning, and scheduling procedures on childhood adjustment and the formation of oral symptoms." Child Development 123 (September): 185-191.

1952 "Social status and the measured intelligence of small city and rural children." American Sociological Review 17 (October): 612-616.

1953 "Rejoinder to Prof. LaBarres' letter on infant training and the personality of the child." American Journal of Sociology 58 (January): 419-420.

1956 "Some observations on theory testing." Rural Sociology 21 (March): 1-12.

1957 "Rejoinder to Prof. Sampson's empiricism and psychoanalysis in the sociology of the family." Marriage and Family Living 19 (November): 398.

1959 "Factors in the relationship of social status to personality." American Sociological Review 24 (August): 511-520.

1961 "Social class and childhood personality." Sociometry 34 (December): 340-356.

1963 "Some recent developments in socialization theory and research." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 349 (September): 163-181.

1964 "Community of residence and college plans." American Sociological Review 29 (February): 24-38.

Sewell, William H. and O.M. Davidson
1956 "The adjustment of Scandinavian students." The Journal of Social Issues 12(1): 9-19.

Sewell, William H. and A.O. Haller
1956 "Social status and the personality adjustment of the child." Sociometry 19 (June): 114-125.

1957 "Farm residence and levels of educational and occupational aspiration." American Journal of Sociology 60 (January): 407-411.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and George W. Ohlendorf
1970 "The educational and early occupational status attainment process: replication and revision." American Sociological Review 35 (December): 1014-1027.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller and Alejandro Portes
1969 "The educational and early occupational attainment process." American Sociological Review 34 (February): 82-92.

Sewell, William H., A.O. Haller and M.A. Straus
1957 "Social status and educational and occupational aspirations." American Sociological Review 22 (February): 67-73.

Sewell, William H., H.F. Kaufman, O.D. Duncan, and N. Gross
1953 "Problems of theory and method in the study of social stratification in rural society." Rural Sociology 18 (March): 12-24.

Sewell, William H., D.G. Marshall, A.O. Haller, and W.A. DeHart
1953 "Factors associated with attitude toward high school education in rural Wisconsin." Rural Sociology 18 (December): 359-365.

Sewell, William H., R.T. Morris, and O.M. Davidson
1954 "Scandinavian student's images of the United States: a study in cross-cultural education." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 295 (September): 126-135.

Sewell, William H., P.H. Mussen, and C.W. Harris
1955 "Relationships among child training practices." American Sociological Review 20 (April): 137-148.

Singelmann, Joachim and Marta Tienda
1979 "Changes in industry structure and female employment in Latin America: 1950-1970." Sociology and Social Research 63: 745-771.

Slesinger, Doris P.
1974 "The relationship of fertility to measures of metropolitan dominance: a new look." Rural Sociology 39 (Fall): 350-361.

1975 "Social structure and utilization of preventive medical services." Psychiatric Spectator 10: 14.

1980 "Rapid changes in household composition among low income mothers." Family Relations: A Journal of Applied Family and Child Studies 29 (April): 221-228.

1980 "Racial and residential differences in preventive medical care for infants in low income populations." Rural Sociology 45 (Spring): 69-90.

Slesinger, Doris P., M. McDivitt and F. O'Donnell
1980 "Food patterns in an urban population: Age and sociodemographic correlates." The Journal of Gerontology 35 (May): 432-441.

Slesinger, Doris P., R. Tessler, and D. Mechanic
1976 "The effects of social characteristics on the utilization of preventive medical services in contrasting health care programs." Medical Care 14 (May): 392-404.

Smith, Suzanne, Eugene A. Wilkening and Jose Pastore
1971 "Interaction of sociological and ecological variables affecting women's satisfaction in Brasilia." International Journal of Comparative Sociology 12 (June): 114-127.

Snipp, C. Matthew and Gene F. Summers
1977 "Industry brings community change." Small Town 7 (December): 10-12.

Spenner, Kenneth and David L. Featherman
1978 "Achievement ambitions." The Annual Review of Sociology 4: 373-420.

Stanfield, J. David
1971 "Una tipologia de integracion: cuatro orientaciones de confianza." Estudio Andinos 11(1).

1972 "Mass media use and opportunity structure in rural Brazil." Public Opinion Quarterly 36 (Spring).

Straus, Murray A. and A.J. Estep
1958 "Do questionnaires tell the truth?" County Agent: Vo-Ag Teacher 14 (October): 28.

Summers, Gene F.
1974 "Large industry in a rural area." The Research Review: 5-11.

1976 "Small towns beware: industry can be costly." Planning 42 (May): 20-21.

1977 "Industrial development in rural America." Journal of Community Development Society 8 (Spring): 6-18.

1978 "Rural industry: myth and reality." Environmental Impact Assessment 37 (October): 4-6.

Summers, Gene F. and E.M. Beck
1973 "Social status and personality factors in predicting interviewer performance." Sociological Methods and Research 2 (August): 112-122.

Summers, Gene F., Marianne Burke, Suzanne Saltiel and John P. Clark
1971 "Stability of the structure of work orientations among high school students." Multivariate Behavioral Research 6 (January): 35-50.

Summers, Gene F., John P. Clark and Lauren H. Seiler
1970 "The renewal of community sociology." Rural Sociology 35 (June): 218-231.

Summers, Gene F. and Frank Clemente
1976 "Industrial development, income distribution, and public policy." Rural Sociology 41 (Summer): 248-268.

Summers, Gene F., Richard L. Hough, Doyle P. Johnson and Kathryn A. Veatch
1970 "Ascetic Protestantism and political preference: a reexamination." Review of Religious Research 12 (Fall): 17-25.

Summers, Gene F. and Jean M. Lang
1976 "Bringing jobs to people: does it pay?" Small Town 7 (September): 4-11.

Summers, Gene F., Lauren H. Seiler and Richard L. Hough
1971 "Psychiatric symptoms: cross-validation with a rural sample." Rural Sociology 36 (September): 367-378.

Tienda, Marta
1977 "Diferenciacion regional y la transformacion sectoral de la fuerza de trabajo femenina: Mexico, 1970." Demografia y Economia 9: 307-325.

1979 "The economic activity of children in Peru: labor force behavior in rural and urban contexts." Rural Sociology 44 (Summer): 370-391.

1980 "Age and economic dependency in Peru: A family life cycle analysis." Journal of Marriage and the Family 42: 639-652.

1980 "Dependency, extension and the 'family life cycle squeeze' in Peru." Journal of Comparative Family Studies (Autumn).

1980 "Child and spouse replacement mechanisms: A life cycle perspective on family composition in Peru." International Journal of Sociology of the Family 10: 67-80.

1980 "Familism and structural assimilation of Mexican immigrants in the United States." International Migration Review 14: 383-408.

Van Es, John C. and William Flinn

1973 "A note on the determinants of satisfaction among urban migrants in Bogota, Colombia." Inter-American Economic Affairs 27 (Autumn): 15-28.

Van Es, John C. and Eugene A. Wilkening

1970 "Response stability in survey research: a cross cultural comparison." Rural Sociology 35 (June): 191-205.

Vaske, Jerry, Maureen Donnelly and Thomas A. Heberlein

1980 "Perceptions of crowding and resource quality by early and more recent visitors." Leisure Sciences 3 (4): 367-381.

Voss, Paul R.

1977 "Population data in social science data archives: the survey holdings of the Roper Public Opinion Research Center." Demography 14 (February): 141-144.

1977 "Data at the Roper Public Opinion Research Center for researchers in the sociology of religion." Review of Religious Research 18 (Spring): 290-292.

1980 "A test of 'gangplank syndrome' among recent migrants to upper Great Lakes region." Journal of the Community Development Society 11 (Spring): 95-111.

Voss, Paul R. and Glenn V. Fuguitt

1979 "Population growth in rural America." Environmental Comment (February): 1-9.

Warner, W. Keith

1964 "Attendance and division of labor in voluntary associations." Rural Sociology 29 (December): 396-407.

1965 "Problems of participation." Journal of Cooperative Extension 3 (Winter): 219-228.

1967 "Feedback in administration." Journal of Cooperative Extension 5 (Spring): 35-46.

1967 "Problems in measuring the goal attainment of voluntary organizations." Adult Education 19 (Fall): 3-14.

Warner, W. Keith and A. Eugene Havens

1967 "The logic of collective action: a review essay." Land Economics 43 (November): 446-450.

1968 "Goal displacement and the intangibility of organizational goals." Administrative Science Quarterly 12 (March): 539-555.

Warner, W. Keith and William D. Heffernan
1967 "The benefit-participation contingency in voluntary farm organizations." Rural Sociology 32 (June): 139-153.

Warner, W. Keith and James S. Hilander
1964 "The relationship between size of organization and membership participation." Rural Sociology 29 (March): 30-39.

Warner, W. Keith and Sidney J. Miller
1964 "Organizational problems in two types of voluntary associations." American Journal of Sociology 69 (May): 654-657.

Warner, W. Keith and David L. Rogers
1971 "Some correlates of control in voluntary farm organizations." Rural Sociology 36 (September): 326-339.

Wileden, Arthur F.
1925 "A county council of community clubs." Rural America 13 (June).

1932 "Kenosha studies itself." Rural America 20 (June).

1933 "Possible contributions of rural sociology to agricultural extension work." American Sociological Society 27 (May).

1934 "Neglected youth: what about them?" Rural America (May).

1935 "Do we still believe in democracy?" Extension Service Review 6 (June).

1936 "Rural youth in Douglas County, Wisconsin." Agricultural Leaders Digest 19 (November).

1936 "Wisconsin has a county youth club." Agricultural Leaders Digest 19 (November).

1937 "State organization for adult education." Journal of Educational Sociology (May).

1938 "What is needed to put rural sociological research on a sounder basis?" Farm Population and Rural Life Activities 12 (January).

1939 "Rural sociology extension in the agriculture colleges." Rural Sociology 4 (March): 43-57.

1946 "Strengthening rural communities." Wisconsin Welfare, Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare (October).

1948 "Recreation trends in the rural community." Recreation Magazine, National Recreation Association 11 (December).

1949 "The forgotten village." Farm Policy Forum 5 (October).

1949 "Let's not take recreation for granted; the forgotten village; trends in rural recreation: past and present; the new trend in recreation." Series of 4 articles -- Extension Service Review (March, April, May and July).

1949 "Recent social trends and the YMCA." Association Forum 4 (January, February).

1950 "The schools' place in the modern community." Wisconsin Journal of Education 8 (January).

1951 "Being good neighbors in the community." Stock and Dairy Farmer 6 (Spring).

1953 "Population trends in Wisconsin and their significance to the church." American Mission Together -- In His Name 7 (September).

1955 "Catch and keep a wife." The Young Farmer 1 (Spring).

1955 "A case approach in teaching rural community organization." Rural Sociology 20 (June): 152-154.

1958 "Church-community relationships in the world wide mission." Town and Country Church 131 (February).

1959 "The sociologist's role in public policy discussions." Rural Sociology 24 (June): 131-139.

1965 "The family and the community." Recreation Magazine, National Recreation Association (January).

Wilkening, Eugene A.

1952 "Informal leaders and innovators in farm practices." Rural Sociology 17 (September): 272-275.

1954 "Change in farm technology as related to familism, family decision-making, and family integration." American Sociological Review 19 (February): 29-37.

1954 "Techniques of assessing farm family values." Rural Sociology 19 (March): 39-49.

1956 "The role of communicating agents in technological change in agriculture." Social Forces 34 (May): 362-367.

1958 "Joint decision-making as a function of status and role." American Sociological Review 23 (April): 187-192.

1958 "Consensus on role definition of county extension agents between the agents and local sponsoring committee members." Rural Sociology 23 (June): 184-197.

1958 "An introductory note on the social aspects of practice adoption." Rural Sociology 23 (June): 97-102.

1960 "Human factors in the changing rural scene." The Journal of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science 26 (March): 11-18.

1964 "Some perspectives on change in rural societies." Rural Sociology 29 (March): 1-17.

1965 "Alguns problemas do planejamento de pesquisa sobre mudanca social em areas rurais do Brasil." Sociologia 27 (March): 37-48.

1968 "A refinement of the resource theory of family power." Sociological Focus (Winter).

1971 "Changing structure of family farms in the United States." Wies Wspolczsna (Poland) 15 (Winter): 83-91.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Lakshmi K. Bharadwaj
1967 "Dimensions of aspirations, work roles, and decision-making of farm husbands and wives in Wisconsin." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29 (November): 703-711.

1968 "Aspirations and task involvement as related to decision-making among farm husbands and wives." Rural Sociology 33 (March): 30-45.

1973 "Canonical analysis of farm satisfaction data." Rural Sociology 38 (Summer): 159-173.

1974 "Occupational satisfaction of farm husbands and wives." Human Relations 26 (October): 739-753.

Wilkening, Eugene A., F.H. Buttel and Richard Rodefeld
1976 "Ideology and social indicators of the quality of life." Rural Sociology 41 (Winter): 452-471.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Boguslaw Galeski
1977 "Quality of life: what is it?" Newsline 5 (January): 2-4.

Wilkening, Eugene A., J.W. Gartrell and Hartley Presser
1973 "Curvilinear and linear models relating status and innovative behavior: a reassessment." Rural Sociology 38 (Winter).

Wilkening, Eugene A., C.C. Giesler and Oscar B. Martinson
1977 "Outdoor recreation and environmental concern: a restudy." Rural Sociology 42 (Summer): 241-249.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Sylvia Guerrero
1969 "Consensus in aspirations for farm improvement and adoption of farm practices." Rural Sociology 34 (June).

Wilkening, Eugene A., Sylvia Guerrero and Spring Ginsberg
1972 "Distance and intergenerational ties of farm families." Sociological Quarterly 13 (Summer): 383-396.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Ralph K. Huitt
1961 "Farmer political participation as related to socio-economic status and perception of the political process." Rural Sociology 26 (December): 395-408.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Eugen Lupri
1965 "Decision-making in German and American farm families: a cross-cultural comparison." Sociologia Ruralis 5(4): 366-375.

Wilkening, Eugene A., Oscar B. Martinson and Richard Rodefeld
1976 "Feelings of powerlessness and social isolation among large-scale farm personnel." Rural Sociology 41 (Winter): 452-471.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and David McGranahan
1978 "Correlates of subjective well-being in northern Wisconsin." Social Indicators Research 5: 211-234.

Wilkening, Eugene A., Joao Bosco Pinto and Jose Pastore
1968 "The role of the extended family in migration and adaptation in Brazil." Journal of Marriage and the Family 30 (November): 689-695.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Richard Smith
1958 "Perception of functions, organizational orientation and role definition of a group of special extension agents." The Midwest Sociologist 21 (December): 19-28.

Wilkening, Eugene A., Joan Tully and Hartley Presser
1962 "Communication and acceptance of recommended farm practices among dairy farmers of northern Victoria." Rural Sociology 27 (June): 116-197.

1964 "Factors in decision-making in farming problems." Human Relations 17 (November): 295-320.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and J.C. Van Es
1967 "Aspirations and attainments among German farm families." Rural Sociology 32 (December): 446-455.

Woelfel, Joseph and Archibald O. Haller
1971 "Reply to Land, Henry and Hummon." American Sociological Review 36 (December): 1102-1103.

1971 "Significant others, the self-reflexive act, and the attitude formation process." American Sociological Review 36 (February): 74-87.

Yoder, Michael and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1979 "Urbanization, frontier growth, and population redistribution in Brazil." Luso-Brazilian Review 16 (1): 67-90.

Yoesting, Dean R. and Douglas G. Marshall
1969 "Trade pattern changes of open-country residents: a longitudinal study." Rural Sociology 34 (1): 85-91.

Zuiches, James J. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1976 "Public attitudes toward population distribution policies." Growth and Change 7 (April): 28-33.

Bulletins and Published Reports

Al-Khazraji, M.G. and D.G. Marshall
1963 Wisconsin's Changing North: An Analysis of Selected Social and Economic Characteristics, 1940-1960. Population Series 60-4, Applied Population Laboratory, Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Anderson, Don S. and Martin P. Anderson
1935 Is Dairying Doomed in Wisconsin? Discussion Guide, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

1936 What Program of Agricultural Conservation is Needed? Special Circular, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

Anderson, Martin P.
1941 Group Discussion Guide for Rural Organization Leaders. Series No. 1, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

1941 How to Discuss Defense Problems. Special Circular, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

Barton, John R.
1940 Rural Cultural Arts in Wisconsin. Special Circular, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Beegle, J. Allan, D.G. Marshall and Rodger Rice
1963 Selected Factors Related to County Migration Patterns in the North Central States. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Belsito, Judy and Donald E. Johnson
1980 A Study of Adolescent Polydrug Use and Related Problems-Poynette High School--1980. Department of Rural Sociology mimeo. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Bodga, Ann and Donald E. Johnson
1980 Community Consensus--Oconto. University of Wisconsin-Extension Mimeograph.

Bogda, Ann, Donald E. Johnson and L. Meiller
1979 Community Consensus--Belleville. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Dane County Extension.

1979 Community Consensus--Cambridge. University of Wisconsin--Extension, Dane County Extension.

1979 Community Consensus--Deerfield. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Dane County Extension.

Boynton, Agnes and E.L. Kirkpatrick
1935 Possibilities of a Rural Youth Movement. Special Circular, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (September).

Brenneke, Gretchen and Douglas G. Marshall
1963 Population Changes by Counties, Wisconsin, April 1, 1960-July 1, 1963. Population Notes 60-4, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Bultena, Gordon
1966 The Changing Distribution and Adequacy of Medical, Dental and Hospital Services in Rural and Urban Communities in Wisconsin, 1910-1960. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Bultena, Gordon, Peter M. Cove and A.F. Wileden
1965 Wisconsin Farm and Home Week: A Study of Goals and Goal Attainment. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Bultena, Gordon, Robert Oyler and Thomas Rausch
1966 A Study of Older Persons: Price County, Wisconsin. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Bultena, Gordon L. and Marvin J. Taves
1963 Canoe-Camping for Adolescents. Minnesota Farm and Home Science XX (Winter).

Butcher, John and Douglas G. Marshall
1970 Changes in Attitudes Toward Medicare and Health Services in Waupaca, Wisconsin -- 1966-1968. Population Series No. 60-22 (May), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Cartter, Bruce L.
1944 Planning for Group Discussion. Special Circular, Rural Sociology Department, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1945 Education in Rural Wisconsin-What is the Problem? (I); -What Do We Want? (II); -How Do We Get What We Want? (III). Special Circulars, Extension Service, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Cell, Charles P. and Donald E. Johnson
1979 Wisconsin Farmers in 1977: A Regional Profile. Population Notes 9 (June), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Employee Relations (Women)
1979 Report of Survey of UWEX Women's Career Interests and Advancement. University of Wisconsin-Extension. (Doris Slesinger was project director.)

Christiansen, John R., H.C. Groot, and Donald E. Johnson
1971 Wisconsin County and District Fair Publications, No. 1-9. Center of Applied Sociology, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

Clark, Robert C.
1960 Extension as a Profession. The Role of Cooperative Extension Supervisors, National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study.

Clark, Robert C. and Fawzi M. Abdullah
1965 Functions of the County Extension Director in the Cooperative Extension Service. Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 255 (February), University of Wisconsin.

Clark, Robert C. and Roland H. Abraham
1960 Administration in Extension. National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Clark, Robert C. and G.L. Carter, Jr.
1961 Selected Readings and References on 4-H Club Work. National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, University of Wisconsin.

Clark, Robert C. and Russell G. Mawby
1965 Professional Leadership in Youth Programs. National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, University of Wisconsin.

Clark, Robert C. and N.P. Ralston
1962 Directing the Cooperative Extension Service. National Agricultural Extension Center for Advanced Study, Unviersity of Wisconsin-Madison.

Clark, Robert C., Eugene A. Wilkening and Lenore Landry
1956 Effectiveness of a Clothing Handbook in Teaching 4-H Club Members. Research Bulletin No. 522, Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin.

Copp, James H. and Robert L. Clark
1956 Factors Associated with Re-enrollment in 4H Clubs. Research Bulletin No. 195, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Davis, Kenneth S. and M.P. Anderson
1937 What Program of Erosion Control is Needed in America? Stencil Circular No. 191, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Davis, Nancy J. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1976 Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Migration Streams in Wisconsin 1965-1970. Population Series 70-6, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

de Janvry, Alain and A. Eugene Havens
1977 Research Framework for the Analysis of Rural Development in the Andean Region. Ford Foundation Review, Number 5.

Di Santo, Joseph E., Carolyn Chambers, Laura Di Santo, and D.G. Marshall
1963 Marital Status 1900-1960, and Marriage 1960 of Wisconsin's Population. No. 7 Population Series, Applied Population Laboratory, Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin (November).

Doerflinger, Jon A. and Douglas G. Marshall
1960 The Story of Price County, Wisconsin: Population Research in a Rural Development County. Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 220, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Durant, Thomas J. and Douglas G. Marshall
1968 Wisconsin's Changing North: An Analysis of Selected Social and Economic Characteristics: 1948-1968. Population Series 60-16, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1969 Wisconsin's Upper Great Lakes Region: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics: 1940-1968. Population Series 60-18 (June), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1970 Wisconsin's Preliminary Population Changes, 1960-1970. Population Note No. 60-12 (August), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Eroen, Norma L., Wayne H. Weidemann and D.G. Marshall
1963 Kenosha County, Wisconsin, Study: Role and Function of Selected Public Institutions in a Changing Society. Report No. 3, Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin (January).

Eteng, William Inya A. and Douglas G. Marshall
1969 Response to Hospital Treatment, Charges and Recovery in "Watertown," Wisconsin (1966). Population Series 60-17, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1970 Retirement and Migration in the North Central States: A Comparative Analysis: Wisconsin, Florida, Arizona. Population Series No. 60-20 (March), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Ewbank, H.L. and M.P. Anderson
1936 Who Should Pay the Doctor Bills? Stencil Circular No. 174, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

Felton, Mrs. Carl
1928 Goose Money. Special Circular, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (June).

Flinn, William L.
1968 The Process of Migration to a Shantytown. Land Tenure Center Research Paper No. 53, University of Wisonsin-Madison.

Froker, R.K. and M.P. Anderson
1936 How Can the Buyer Get His Money's Worth? Stencil Circular No. 178, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

Fuchs, Zahava, Richard B. Kearl and Douglas G. Marshall
1966 Population Changes and Forecasts in Wisconsin by Counties, 1960-1980. Population Series 60-11, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Fuchs, Zahava and Douglas G. Marshall
1966 Fertility Trends in Wisconsin, 1900-1963. Population Series 60-10, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1968 The Socioeconomic Composition of Wisconsin's Population, 1900-1960. Population Series 60-12, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Fuchs, Zahava, Helen Poppe and Douglas G. Marshall
1968 Population Estimates by Counties, Wisconsin, July 1, 1967 and July 1, 1968. Population Notes 60-7, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Fuguitt, Glenn V.

1961 The Changing Age Structure of Wisconsin's Population. Population Series 60-3, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1961 Population Change Patterns of Wisconsin Counties. Population Notes 60-1, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1961 Rural and Urban Population Change in Wisconsin, 1950-1960. Population Series 60-2, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1964 Growing and Declining Villages in Wisconsin, 1950-1960. Population Series No. 60-8, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1964 Dissertations in Demography 1933-1963. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1971 Reference Tables, Population Change of Counties and Incorporated Places in Wisconsin, 1950-1970. Population Series 70-1, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1977 Reference Tables: Population Trends and Net Migration for the States and Regions of the United States, 1950-1974. Population Series 70-8, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Fuguitt, Glenn V., and Calvin L. Beale

1976 Population Change in Nonmetropolitan Cities and Towns. Agricultural Economic Report No. 323, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (February).

Fuguitt, Glenn V., Douglas G. Marshall and Constance Stouse

1962 The Changing Age Structure of Wisconsin's Population. Population Series No. 3, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Galpin, Charles J.

1912 A Method of Making a Social Survey. Circular No. 29, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1913 Rural Social Development. 3rd Annual Report of Wisconsin Country Life Conference (January).

1914 Rural Social Centers in Wisconsin. Bulletin No. 234, Wisconsin Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1915 The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community. Research Bulletin No. 34, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1917 Rural Strategy. American Baptist Home Mission Society.

1917 The Church, An Economic and Social Force. Bulletin No. 278, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Galpin, Charles J. and Alonzo B. Cox
1919 Rural Social and Economic Problems in the U.S. Bulletin No. 3, American Association for Agriculture Legislation, University of Wisconsin.

Galpin, C.J., G.W. Davies and Grace Wyan-Stone
1915 Social Surveys in Rural School Districts. Circular No. 51, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (February).

Galpin, C.J. and Emily F. Hoag
1919 Farm Tenancy: An Analysis of the Occupancy of 500 Farms. Research Bulletin No. 44, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1919 The Rural Community Fair. Bulletin No. 307, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Galpin, C.J. and J.A. James
1918 Rural Relations in High Schools. Bulletin No. 288, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Galpin, C.J. and D.W. Sawtell
1916 Rural Clubs in Wisconsin. Bulletin No. 271, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Galpin, C.J. and Eleanor Wiseman
1919 Play Days in Rural Schools. Circular No. 118, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Gasson, Ruth, Archibald O. Haller and William H. Sewell
1972 Attitudes and Facilitation in Status Attainment. Arnold M. and Carolyn Rose Monographs in Sociology. Washington: American Sociological Association; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gessner, Amy A.
1936 Young People in Taylor County. Special Circular, Rural Youth and Rural Life Series, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin (October).

1937 Ten Years of Drama in Rural Wisconsin. Stencil Circular No. 194, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

Gessner, Amy A. and Mrs. C.I. Corp
1933 Selected Short Plays for Rural Groups. Radio Circular, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Gessner, Amy A. and Verne E. Varney
1935 Recreation for the Farm Home. Stencil Circular No. 167, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin (September).

Gessner, Amy A. and A.F. Wileden
1933 Special Community Activities. Stencil Circular No. 135, Extension Service, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Gilbert, E. Reid and Douglas G. Marshall
1970 Retirement and Migration in the North Central States: Planning for Retirement. Population Series No. 60-21 (March), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Havens, A. Eugene
1973 Influence of Political and Institutional Factors on Access to Agricultural Production -- Improving Technologies: Colombian case study. Mexico City: Ford Foundation Office.

1975 Approaches to Rural Development: Theoretical Praxis and Program Limitations. Ford Foundation Review, Number 3.

Havens, A.E., D.E. Johnson, et al.
1980 Some Social Consequences of the Dana Corporation's Plant Closing in Edgerton. Madison: Team for Analysis of Social Concerns (TASC), Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin--Extension (December).

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Jerry Vaske
1977 Crowding and Visitor Conflict on the Bois Brule River. Technical Report WIS WRC 77-04, Water Resources Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Henkel, Ramon and Douglas Marshall
1963 Wisconsin's Labor Force Source Tables for Counties, 1960 and 1950-1960 Change. Population Note No. 60-5, Applied Population Laboratory, Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin (December).

Hill, George W.
1948 Texas-Mexican Migratory Agriculture Workers in Wisconsin. Stencil Bulletin No. 6, Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin (May).

Hill, George W., Walter Slocum and Ruth Hill
1938 Man-Land Adjustment. Research Bulletin No. 134, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Hill, George W. and Ronald A. Smith
1941 Man in the "Cut-Over." Research Bulletin No. 139, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Hill, Richard C. and Douglas G. Marshall
1968 Retirement and Migration in the North Central States--Personal Adjustment to the Retirement Transition in Three Wisconsin Communities. Population Series 60-15, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1968 Anticipatory Socialization to the Retirement Role. Population Note 60-8, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1968 Are Attitudes Toward Retirement Changing? Mimeograph. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin (August).

Honnen, James S., William I.A. Eteng and Douglas G. Marshall
1969 Retirement and Migration in the North Central States: Comparative Socioeconomic Analysis: Wisconsin and Florida. Population Series No. 60-19 (July), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Hutchins, H. Clifton and A.F. Wileden
1962 Washington Island: Challenge and Opportunity. Community Series No. 4, Rural Sociology Department, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Inge, Marvel and Gwen Stenehjem
n.d. Let Me Be Thankful. Rural Sociology Department Mimeograph, University of Wisconsin.

James, J.A. and J.H. Kolb
1936 Wisconsin Rural Youth. Bulletin No. 437, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Johnson, Donald E.
1963 The Changing Small Community. Community Development in Rural Areas, Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1963 The Departmental Role of the Extension Specialist. Role of Rural Sociologists; Proceedings of the Regional Seminar on Resource Development, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service Publication MM-236, Ohio State University-Columbus.

1966 The Role of the Church in a Secular Society. In the Changing Small Community. Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1973 Wisconsin Resources for the Elderly: Agency Trends and Audiences. Madison: Division on Aging, Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services (March).

1974 Why the Hard to Reach? Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension.

1974 Comparative Surveys of the Elderly in Manitowoc and Brown Counties, Wisconsin (Manitowoc County Edition). Center of Applied Sociology, Department of Rural Sociology (November), University of Wisconsin-Madison. Also, Brown County Edition (November).

1974 A Survey of Pre-Retirement Households in Brown County, Wisconsin. Center of Applied Sociology, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1976 Wisconsin's Title V Effort: Leadership, Land Use and Local Development.: Ames, Iowa: Rural Development News 2 (February).

Johnson, Donald E. and Sue Kau
1977 Baldwin Trade Area Survey--Preliminary Report. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Extension.

1977 Hudson Trade Area Survey--Preliminary Report. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Extension.

1977 Lodi Trade Area Survey--Preliminary Report. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Johnson, Donald E. and W.K. Warner
1966 Wisconsin Farm Organizations and Cooperatives: Membership and Patronage. Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 581 (March), University of Wisconsin.

Johnson, Donald E. and E.A. Wilkening
1961 Five Years of Farm and Home Development in Wisconsin. Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin No. 228 (June), University of Wisconsin.

Johnson, Donald E., et al.
1975 A Comparative Study of the Educational Interests and Needs of Ozaukee County Women. University of Wisconsin-Extension.

1976 Analise Sociologica de Alguns Fatores Relacionados com Adocao de Praticas Agricolas en Estrela e Frederico-Westphalen, RS. Serie de Estudos e Trabailhos Mimeografados do Centro de Estudos e Pesquisas Economicas. Porto Alegre, Brazil, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, No. 30.

Kale, Balkrishna and Paul R. Voss
1978 The Wisconsin Population Estimation System: An Evaluation Based on Special Census Enumerations. Technical Series 70-4. Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L.
1930 Standards of Living: Let's Live While We Work. Circular No. 241, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin (September).

1930 The English River Congregation of the Church of the Brethern. Monograph Series No. 2, State Historical Society of Iowa.

1931 Better Living in Home and Community. Circular No. 247, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1934 Rural Rehabilitation and Relief. Circular, Wisconsin Emergency Relief Administration.

1935 What Rural Young People Do and Want to Do. Special Circular, Agriculture Extension Service. College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1935 Rural Youth and Rehabilitation. Special Circular, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (March).

1935 What Farm Young People Like and Want. Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1936 Needed Standards of Living for Rural Resettlement. Circular, Wisconsin Rural Rehabilitation Division, Resettlement Administration.

1938 Analysis of 70,000 Rural Rehabilitation Families. Social Research Report No. 9, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

1938 Status of Research Pertaining to Situations and Problems Among Rural Young People. American Youth Commission, Washington, D.C.

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L. and Agnes M. Boynton
1934 American Youth Movement. Circular No. 271, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (November).

1935 Interests and Needs of Rural Youth in Wood County, Wisconsin. Extension Service Special Circular, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L. and Winifred Fergerson
1935 Survey of Relief with Reference to Rural Rehabilitation. Wisconsin Emergency Relief Administration.

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L., J.H. Kolb, Creagh Inge and A.F. Wileden
1929 Rural Organization and the Farm Family. Research Bulletin No. 96, Wisconsin Agriculture Experiment Station (November).

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L., P.E. McHall and May L. Cowles
1932 Farm Family Living in Wisconsin. Research Bulletin No. 114, Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin (January).

Kirkpatrick, Ellis L, Rosalind Tough and May L. Cowles
1934 The Life Cycle of the Farm Family. Research Bulletin No. 121, Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin.

1935 How Farm Families Meet the Emergency. Research Bulletin No. 126, Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin.

Kirkpatrick, E.L. and others
1934 The Lake States Cut-Over Area. 10 reports in a series. Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Washington, D.C.

Klaff, Vivian Z. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1972 Rural and Urban Population Change in Wisconsin, 1960-1970. Population Series 70-3, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison (December).

Kolb, John H.
1921 Rural Primary Groups. Research Bulletin No. 51, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1923 Service Relations of Town and Country. Research Bulletin No. 58, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1925 Service Institutions for Town and Country. Research Bulletin No. 66, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (December).

1933 Trends in Country Neighborhoods. Research Bulletin No. 120, Agriculture Experiment Station, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (November).

1933 Meeting the Farm Crisis. American Library Association, Chicago.

1936 Trends of the Times. Stencil Circular No. 152, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

1945 Rural Commission Ties in Wisconsin. Circular No. 353, Agriculture Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1957 Neighborhood--Family Relations in Rural Society. Research Bulletin No. 201, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Kolb, J.H. and Charles J. Bornman
1924 Rural Religious Organization. Research Bulletin No. 60, Agriculture Experiment Station, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Kolb, J.H. and Leroy Day
1950 Interdependence in Town and Country Relations. Research Bulletin No. 172, Agriculture Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (December).

Kolb, J.H. and D.E. Lindstrom
1923 Home Talent Tournaments. Circular No. 221, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1927 Why Not Have a Play? Special Circular, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

Kolb, J.H. and D.G. Marshall
1944 Neighborhood Community Relations in Rural Society. Research Bulletin No. 154, Agriculture Experiment Station, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Kolb, J.H. and Robert A. Polson
1933 Trends in Town-Country Relations. Research Bulletin No. 117, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (September).

Kolb, J.H. and E.M. Tiffany
1923 Country Life Clubs. Stencil Bulletin No. 65, Agriculture Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (February).

Kolb, J.H. and A.F. Wileden
1926 Rural Community Organizations--Handbook. Bulletin No. 384, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (June).

1927 Special Interest Groups in Rural Society. Research Bulletin No. 84, Wisconsin Agriculture Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin (December).

1927 Why Not Have a Debate? Special Circular, Agriculture Extension Service, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (February).

1928 Making Rural Organizations Effective. Bulletin No. 403, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (October).

Lees, C. Lowell and Amy A. Gessner
1936 When Choosing A Play. Stencil Circular No. 182, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Marshall, Douglas G.
1946 Hamlets and Villages in the United States: Their Place in the American Way of Life. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1953 What is the Future of the Family Farm? University of Wisconsin-Madison (August).

1956 Old Age--Problem or Challenge. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1957 How Wisconsin's Population is Changing--Selected Population Data by Counties: Wisconsin, 1950-1957. (Part II, Revised). Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1959 Wisconsin's Population -- Changes and Prospects. Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 194, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1959 Population Characteristics, Resources, and Prospects in the North Central Region. Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 209 (North Central Regional Publication No. 98.), University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G. and M.G. Al-Khazraji
1962 Wisconsin's Bayfield County: A Comparative Analysis of Some Changing Aspects of Population and Agriculture, 1940-1960. Population Note No. 60-2, Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin (September).

Marshall, Douglas G., James S. Bang and Jon Doerflinger
1962 Kenosha County, Wisconsin, Study: An Overview of the Effects of Population Change. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1962 Kenosha County, Wisconsin, Study: Social Aspects of Land Use and Settlement Patterns. Report No. 2, Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin (February).

Marshall, Douglas G., J.S. Bang, J.A. Doerflinger, G.V. Fuguitt and R.E. Henkel
1961 Population Change and Migration: 1950-1960. Population Series 60-1, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas, Walter Bjoraker and Burton Kreitlow
1955 School Attendance of Wisconsin Rural Youth. Miscellaneous Publication, University of Wisconsin-Madison (February).

Marshall, Douglas G. and Jacqueline Buckman
1965 Estimated Population Changes by Counties, Wisconsin July 1, 1964 and July 1, 1965. Population Note No. 60-6, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin (November).

Marshall, D.G., Joseph Di Santo and Anne Davidson
1963 Wisconsin's Population, Changes and Prospects, 1900-1963. Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 241, University of Wisconsin (March).

Marshall, Douglas G. and Jon Doerflinger
1959 The Changing Role of Agriculture in Price County, Wisconsin. Report No. III, An Analysis of Recent Population Trends in Price County to 1958. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1960 The Story of Price County, Wisconsin. Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 220, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1961 Kenosha County, Wisconsin, Study: An Overview of the Effects of Population Change. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G., Jon Doerflinger and Allan Orman
1958 The Changing Role of Agriculture in Price County, Wisconsin. Report No. 2, Some Highlights Concerning Employment and Migration of Open-Country People. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G. and Zahava Fuchs
1968 The Socioeconomic Composition of Wisconsin's Population, 1900-1960. Population Series 12 (May), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Marshall, Douglas G., Glenn Fuguitt, Frank Bessac and Nancy Marfyak
1957 Population Estimates for Wisconsin Counties, 1957. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, D.G. and Richard C. Hill
1968 The Process of Growing Old: A Test of the Disengagement Hypothesis. Population Note 60-10, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1968 Social Rank, Morale and Anticipatory Socialization to the Retirement Position. Population Note 60-9, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Marshall, Douglas G. and John H. Kolb
1946 Villages and Hamlets Are Capitals of Rural Wisconsin. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G. and Nancy Marfyak
1958 Professional Manpower Needs and Resources in Agriculture and Home Economics--the Role of Higher Education in Wisconsin. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas C., Nancy Marfyak and Anne White

1957 Population Changes and Their Implications for Higher Education in Wisconsin. Background Study XIII, Governor's Coordinating Committee for Higher Education in Wisconsin. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G., Anne Nakamura and Hazel Reinhardt

1968 Family Adjustment in Selected Low Income Areas of Northern Wisconsin. Preliminary Report No. 2, Agency and Institutional Attitudes (May). Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Marshall, Douglas G. and Allan Orman

1957 The Changing Role of Agriculture in Kenosha County, Wisconsin. Report No. 1, Some Highlights Concerning Open-Country People. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1957 The Changing Role of Agriculture in Kenosha County. Report No. 2, Farm Attitudes Toward Nonfarm People. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G., Allan Orman, and Nancy Marfyak

1957 Wisconsin County and Economic Area Data, 1940-1954. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G., Allan Orman and A. White

1958 Tabular Supplement to Research Bulletin: Population Changes and Prospects in the North Central Region, 1900-1958. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G. and Hazel H. Reinhart

1973 The Elder Citizen of Wisconsin. Population Note 70-1, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1973 Fertility in Wisconsin 1960-1970. Population Note 70-2, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1973 Dependent Population and Dependency Rates in Wisconsin 1960-1970. Population Note 70-3, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1973 County Data Book--1970 and 1960 for Wisconsin Counties. Population Series 70-5, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Marshall, D.G., Hazel Reinhardt, Joan Keyes and Terry Marshall
1968 Family Adjustment in Selected Low Income Areas of Northern Wisconsin. Poverty Reports, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, D.G. and Rosemary Rupnow
1964 The Story of Kenosha County, Wisconsin. Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 251, University of Wisconsin-Madison (July).

Marshall, Douglas and Joanne Serie
1965 Mortality Trends in Wisconsin 1900-1963. Population Series 60-9 (May), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G. and Emmit Sharp
1957 The Changing Role of Agriculture in Price County, Wisconsin. Report No. I, Some Highlights Concerning Open-Country People. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, D.G., George W. Sledge, Harold D. Beals and James L. Martin
1963 Farm Male Replacement in Wisconsin, 1940-1980. Department of Agriculture and Extension Education and Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin (December).

Marshall, Douglas G., George Sledge, William Becker and Glenn Fuguitt
1957 Farm Male Replacement in Wisconsin, 1940-60. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G., Anne White, Ramon Henkel and James Bang
1960 Some Preliminary 1960 Population Changes for Wisconsin Counties. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G. and Don Whiteside
1960 Differential Population Growth in Lafayette County, 1847-1958. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Marshall, Douglas G. and Louise Young
1959 A Guide to the Discussion of Security in Old Age. Cooperative Extension Service Bulletin (January), University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Masley, A.L. and A.F. Wileden
1942 Recreation Games for the Social Home. Rural Sociology Department Mimeographed Circular, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Monahan, William and Douglas G. Marshall
1968 Retirement and Migration in the North Central States--Retired Persons in Three Wisconsin Communities. Population Series 60-14, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Newby, Howard
1980 The Green Belt Management Experiments: The Farmers' Response. Report for the Countryside Commission of England and Wales.

1980 The Suffolk NAL Project: The Farmers' Response. Report for the Countryside Commission of England and Wales.

1980 The Current State of Research on Social Stratification in Britain. Interim Report for the SSRC (U.K.).

Pastore, Jose, Fernando Rocha and Eugene A. Wilkening
1968 A Agricultura e o Homem no Distrito Federal, Brasil: Relatorio Preliminar de una Investigacao Sociologica. (Agriculture and Man in the Federal District of Brazil: Preliminary Report of a Sociological Investigation.) Research Report No. 28-P, Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin (March).

Petras, James and A. Eugene Havens
1979 La Deflation Aggrave les Conflits de Classe au Perou. Le Monde Diplomatique (February).

Rathbun, Pam, Donald E. Johnson and R. Hustedde
1978 Sharon--Community Self-Analysis. Elkhorn: Jenson and Johnson, Inc.

Reed, Robert H. and Doris P. Slesinger
1975 Population Statistics for Heritage County Recreation Association. Departments of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Reinhardt, Hazel H., Thomas J. Durant and Douglas G. Marshall
1970 Wisconsin's Upper Great Lakes Region: A Study of Two Communities. Population Series No. 60-24 (October), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Reinhardt, Hazel H. and Douglas G. Marshall
1971 Population Change, 1950, 1960, 1970. Population Series 70-2, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1973 Population Projections 1980, 1990. Population Series 70-4, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Reinhardt, Hazel H., Peter M. Writt and D.G. Marshall
1969 Population by Age for Counties in Wisconsin. Population Note 60-11, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Rodefeld, Richard and Eugene A. Wilkening
1971 Wisconsin Incorporated Farms I: Types and Characteristics and Trends. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin (December).

Rowlands, W.A., F.B. Trenk, George S. Wehrwein and M.P. Anderson
1938 Wisconsin Land Use Program. Stencil Circular 203, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Selvik, Arne and Gene F. Summers
1977 Social Impacts of Nonmetro Industrial Growth. Annotated Bibliography of U.S. Case Studies. SRDC Series Publication No. 18, Mississippi State, Miss.: Southern Rural Development Center (March).

Sewell, William H.
1951 Infant Training and the Personality Adjustments of Rural Children. Research Report, Annual Report of the University Research Committee to the WARF Trustees, 1951-52, University of Wisconsin.

Sewell, William H., R.T. Morris and Oluf M. Davidson
1953 Preliminary Report on the Scandinavian Student Study. Social Science Research Committee, University of Wisconsin-Madison (October).

Sewell, William H., C.E. Ramsey and L.J. Ducoff
1953 Farmers Conceptions and Plans for Economic Security in Old Age. Wisconsin Agricultural Experimental Station Research Bulletin No. 182, University of Wisconsin (September).

Slesinger, Doris P.
1976 The Relationship Between Social Integration and Preventive Medical Care in Poverty Families from Rural and Urban Areas: A Concept Examination. Notes and Comments, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1976 Vaginal Infections: Hemophilus. (rev. 1979); Vaginal Infections: Trichomonas; Vaginal Infections: Yeast; Infecciones vaginales: Vaginitis Indetermindas; Infecciones vaginales: Tricomonas. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1978 Female Sterilization. Menopause. Esterilizacion de la Mujer. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1978 Population Trends in Wisconsin, 1950-1975. Population Notes Number 6, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1979 Infecciones Vaginales: Hemophilus; Hongos, Monilia, Candida. Menopausia. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1979 Health Needs of Migrant Workers in Wisconsin. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1979 Migrant Agricultural Workers in Wisconsin. Population Notes Number 8, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Slesinger, Doris P., Donald Johnson and Prudencio Oyarbide
1977 Health Care Needs of a Hispanic Population in Dane, Dodge and Jefferson Counties. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Slesinger, Doris P. and Paul R. Voss (eds.)
1979 Recent Trends in Wisconsin's Population. Population Series 70-11, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Smith, John and Douglas G. Marshall
1970 Retirement and Migration in the North Central States: Two Planned Retirement Communities. Population Series No. 60-23 (June), Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Smith, T. Lynn and D.G. Marshall
1963 Our Aging Population--The United States and Wisconsin. No. 60-5, Wisconsin's Population Series, Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin (April).

Stern, J.A., D.E. Johnson and H.R. Reinhardt
1974 People, Places and Preferences. University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Straus, Murray A.
1958 Short Term Effects of Farm and Home Development in Wisconsin. In cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (August).

Straus, Murray A. and Allen J. Estep
1959 Education for Technological Change Among Wisconsin Farmers. Research Bulletin No. 214, University of Wisconsin-Madison (August).

Summers, Gene F.
1980 Human Response to Energy Development in the Western United States. Prepared for the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of Interior.

Summers, Gene F. and Richard L. Hough
1970 Educational Sociologists. Center of Applied Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Summers, Gene F., Robert E. Petersen, David M. Skoloda, Michael J. Soref, Dena G. Stoner and Carolyn R. Townsend
1974 Community: Annotated Bibliography of Journal Articles, 1960-1973. Monticello, Illinois: Council of Planning Librarians.

Tienda, Marta
1980 The Social Economy of Energy: Consequences and Alternatives for Families in Northeastern Wisconsin. Research Bulletin R3055, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1980 Social Response to the Energy Crisis. Research Bulletin R3056, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Tienda, Marta and Osei-Mensah Aborampah
1980 Home Ownership and the Energy Crisis. Technical Note, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Tordella, Stephen J.
1977 Net Migration by Age for Wisconsin Counties, 1950-1960 and 1960-1970. Population Series 70-7, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1977 Recreational Housing in Wisconsin Counties, 1970. Population Notes Number 4, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1977 The Elderly Population Living in Wisconsin Counties, 1975. Population Notes Number 5, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1979 Births and Birth Rates of Wisconsin Teenagers, 1960-1975. Population Notes Number 7, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1979 Religion in Wisconsin: Preferences, Practices, and Ethnic Composition. Population Series 70-13, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1980 Reference Tables: Net Migration of Persons Aged 0 to 64, and 65 and Over for United States Counties, 1970 to 1975. Population Series 70-14, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Tordella, Stephen J., Glenn V. Fuguitt, and Doris P. Slesinger
1977 Urban and Rural Population Change in Wisconsin Counties, 1960 to 1975. Population Series 70-9, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Tordella, Stephen J. and Donald E. Johnson
1980 Demographic Trends in the North. University of Wisconsin-Extension.

Trent, John, Donald E. Johnson, L. Meiller, et al.
1978 Community Consensus--Middleton. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Dane County Extension.

1978 Community Consensus--Oregon. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Dane County Extension.

1978 Community Consensus--Waunakee. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Dane County Extension.

Van Es, J.C., Eugene A. Wilkening and Joao Bosco Pinto
1968 Rural Migrants in Central Brazil: A Study of Itumbiara, Goias. Land Tenure Center Research Report No. 29, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Vornhold, D.E.
1937 Music Making in the Rural Community. Stencil Circular No. 188, Agriculture Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (April, Revised: December).

Voss, Paul R.
1978 Precision in the Wisconsin Small-Area Population Estimation System: A Study of Variation in Estimates as Length of Time from the Estimation Base Year Increases. Technical Series 70-3, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Voss, Paul R. and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1979 Turnaround Migration in the Upper Great Lakes Region. Population Series 70-12, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX. (Final Project Report presented to the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, Washington, D.C., August.)

Voss, Paul R. and Henry C. Krebs
1979 The Use of Federal Revenue Data for Improving Current Estimates of Average Household Size for Minor Civil Divisions: An Evaluation. Technical Series 70-5, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Voss, Paul R. and Mark Rank
1980 Characteristics of Recent Migrants to Nonmetropolitan Northern Wisconsin. Population Notes No. 10, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

Warner, W. Keith
1962 Voluntary Organizations in Iowa County, Wisconsin: A Preliminary Report. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1964 The Benefit-Participation Relationship in Voluntary Organizations. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1965 Membership Participation in Voluntary Organizations. Research Bulletin 263, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Warner, W. Keith and Donald E. Johnson
1965 Wisconsin Farm Operator Survey, 1965: A Preliminary Report. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Wehrwein, Carl, H.L. Ewbank and A.F. Wileden
1933 Taxation in Rural Areas. Special Circular, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Weidemann, Wayne E. and Glenn V. Fuguitt

1963 Menominee: Wisconsin's 72nd County. Population Note No. 60-3, Applied Population Laboratory, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Welch, N. Candia and Douglas G. Marshall

1969 Wisconsin Upper Great Lakes Region: A Descriptive Bibliography -- 1935-1968. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Wileden, Arthur F.

1928 Conducting the Business Meeting. Circular No. 227, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (October).

1931 Citizen's Survey of Rural Social Conditions in Kenosha County, Wisconsin. Special Circular, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (December).

1932 Five Years of Rural Dramatics in Wisconsin. Radio Circular. Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

1935 What Kind of Rural Life Have Young People Reason to Expect in the U.S.? U.S.D.A. Extension Service Separate.

1935 Five Years of Public Discussion in Rural Wisconsin. Stencil Circular No. 163, Agriculture Extension Service, University of Wisconsin.

1935 A Recreation Program for the Rural Areas of Wisconsin. Radio Circular, Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1935 What Douglas County Youth Wants and What They are Doing About It. Special Circular, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (December).

1936 Recreation Leaders Laboratory Handbook. Wisconsin Recreation Leaders Laboratory.

1943 Neighborhood Leader System: Manual for Extension Workers. Circular, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1946 Planning Manual for Wisconsin Centennial Celebration. Circular, Wisconsin State Centennial Committee.

1946 How to Conduct a Meeting--Parliamentary Procedure. Special Circular No. 23, Extension Service. Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1951 Teamwork in the Community. Wisconsin Community Organization Committee.

1951 Trends in Rural Organizations in Wisconsin. Special Circular, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (January).

1955 When Planning a Survey. Wisconsin Community Organization Committee.

1957 Social and Economic Backgrounds and Trends in 18 Northern Wisconsin Counties. Report of Study of Churches of Northern Wisconsin, Wisconsin Council of Churches.

1960 Rethinking Roles in the In-Service Training of Rural Clergy. Report of 1960 Conference. Farm Foundation.

1961 Rural Community Development. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison/UWEX.

1962 Diverted Uses of Farm Lands in Wisconsin. Rural Sociology Department, University of Wisconsin.

1962 Recreation Concerns of the Family in the Community. Report of 1st National Rural Family Recreation Seminar, The Research Center.

1963 Recreation: A Challenge to Rural America. Report of 2nd National Rural Family Recreation Seminar, The Center for Better Farm Living.

1965 Identifying the Community Power Structure. North Central Rural Sociology Committee, Extension Publication No. 19, Series No. 2, Cooperative Extension Service, Iowa State University.

1965 45 Years of Church Leaders Conferences in Wisconsin. Report of 1966 Town and Country Leaders Conference on the Changing Small Community.

1979 Early History of the Department of Rural Sociology. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Wileden, Arthur F. (Editor)
1962 The Changing City: Problems and Opportunities. WPCL Report, Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1963 Guiding Social Change: Criteria for Decision Making. WPCL Report, College Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1964 Automation and Human Values. WPCL Report, Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1965 Situation Analysis: A Method for Identification of the Major Problems of the Emerging Community. WPCL Report, Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Wileden, A.F. and H.L. Ewbank
1933 How to Conduct Public Discussion. Stencil Circular No. 140, Agriculture Extension Service, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

1935 How to Conduct Group Discussion. Extension Circular No. 276, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (August).

Wileden, Arthur F. and Amy A. Gessner
1933 Special Community Activities. Stencil Circular No. 135, Extension Service, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Wileden, A.F. and A.L. Mosley
1934 The Social Hour at the Community Meeting. Extension Service Circular 122, College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (October).

Wileden, Arthur F., Wm. Robinson, R.W. MacMorran and John B. Borek
1960 Anatomy of the Suburbs. Extension Publications, National Board of the YMCA.

Wileden, A.F., Ethel Rockwell and Aladyo Borokers
1933 Dramatics for Amateur Groups. Extension Circular No. 257, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin (May).

Wileden, Arthur F. and Al Trancour
1961 French Island: Modern Magic in the Suburbs. Community Series No. 1, Rural Sociology Department, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, University of Wisconsin.

Wilkening, Eugene A.
1953 Adoption of Improved Farm Practices as Related to Family Factors. Research Bulletin No. 183 (December), Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin.

1955 How Farm People Accept New Ideas. North Central Regional Publication No. 1, Agriculture Extension Series, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

1956 Preliminary Report No. 1 -- Roles of County Extension Agents; Recruitment, Training and Selected Personal Characteristics of 90 Wisconsin County Extension Workers. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

1956 Preliminary Report No. 2 -- Roles of County Extension Agents; Role Discrepancy as a Measure of Stress in Cooperative Extension Work. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

1956 Preliminary Report No. 3 -- Roles of County Extension Agents; Clientele and Cooperating Associations and Agencies as Viewed by 90 Wisconsin County Extension Workers. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

1956 Preliminary Report No. 4 -- Roles of County Extension Agents; Program Planning, Local Leadership and County Coordination of 90 Wisconsin County Extension Workers. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

1957 The County Extension Agent in Wisconsin. Research Bulletin No. 203, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin.

1969 Comparison of Migrants in Two Rural and an Urban Area of Central Brazil. Land Tenure Center Research Paper No. 35 (February), University of Wisconsin.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Nancy Ahrens
1978 Social Determinants of Subjective Well-Being in Northwestern Wisconsin. Research Bulletin R2968, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Lakshmi K. Bharadwaj
1966 Aspirations, Work Roles and Decision-Making Patterns. Research Bulletin No. 266, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Charles L. Cleland
1957 Some Characteristics of Farm and Home Development in Wisconsin: As Viewed by the Agents. Preliminary Report No. 2, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

Wilkening, Eugene A., F.C. Fliegel and James H. Copp
1956 Characteristics of Young Farm Families. Preliminary Report No. 1 of Social and Economic Aspects of a Farm and Home Development Program for Young Farm Families. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Sugiyama Iutaka
1967 Sociological Aspects of Colonization as Viewed from Brazil. Land Tenure Center Report No. 37, University of Wisconsin (June).

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Donald E. Johnson
1961 Goals in Farm Decision-Making as Related to Practice Adoption. Research Bulletin No. 225, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin - Madison.

1961 Five Years of Farm and Home Development in Wisconsin. Research Bulletin No. 228, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Wisconsin - Madison.

Wilkening, Eugene A., Virginia Lambert, D. McGranahan and O.B. Martinson
1974 Public Programs, Services and Policies in Four Northwestern Counties. Report No. 41, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin (December).

Wilkening, Eugene A., D. McGranahan, J. Hutchison and C. Geisler
1975 The Use of Leader Ratings to Assess Community Services and Characteristics in the Kickapoo Valley. Institute of Environmental Studies Report No. 45, University of Wisconsin-Madison (April).

Wilkening, Eugene A., William N. Parker, W. Paul Strassmann and Robert S. Merrill
1962 The Diffusion of Technical Knowledge as an Instrument of Economic Development. Symposia Studies Series No. 13, The National Institute of Social and Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C.

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Richard Rodefeld
1971 Wisconsin Incorporated Farms II: Characteristics of Resident Owners, Hired Managers and Hired Workers. Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison (December).

Wilkening, Eugene A. and Frank A. Santopolo
1952 The Diffusion of Improved Farm Practices from Unit Test Demonstration Farms in TVA Watershed Counties of North Carolina. Report to TVA Agricultural Relations Section.

Wilkening, Eugene A., P. Wopat, J.G. Linn, C. Geisler and D. McGranahan
1973 Quality of Life in Kickapoo Valley Communities. Report II, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison (September).

Working Papers

Aiken, Michael, A. Eugene Havens, and William L. Flinn
1976 "The adoption of innovations: the neglected role of instituional constraints." Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Angel, Ron and Marta Tienda
1980 "Household Composition and Income Generation Strategies Among Anglos, Hispanics and Blacks in the United States." Working Paper 80-4. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Beck, E.M. and G.F. Summers
1973 "Industrial development, and changes in occupation structures." Rural Industrial Development 73.11, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Bensman, Miriam, and Archibald O. Haller
1978 "Locus of control and status attainment." ERIC-CRESS microfiche. Las Cruces: New Mexico State University.

Clemente, Frank and G.F. Summers
1972 "Rapid Industrial Development and the relative status of the sexes." Rural Industrial Development 72.15, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1973 "Rural industrial development and commuting patterns." Rural Industrial Development 73.15, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1973 "The journey to work." Rural Industrial Development 73.18, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1973 "Large industries in small towns: who benefits?" Rural Industrial Development 73.9, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1973 "An explanatory note on family status and work-residence separation." Rural Industrial Development 73.14, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Featherman, David L.
1977 "Has opportunity declined in America?" Discussion Paper No.437-77, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1977 "The effects of schooling and the transition from school to work." Working Paper 77-45, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Featherman, David L., Michael Sobel, and David Dickens
1975 "A manual for coding occupations and industries into detailed 1970 categories and a listing of 1970-basis Duncan Socioeconomic and NORC prestige scales." Working Paper 75-1, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Flinn, William L.
1966 "Rural to Urban Migrations: A Colombian Case." Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Fuguitt, Glenn V.
1976 "The growth and decline of nonmetropolitan cities and villages." Working Paper 76-16, Center for Demograhy and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Fuguitt, Glenn V., M.L. Yoder, D.E. Johnson, L.T. Medeiros, and I.A. Schneider
1976 "Urban growth in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil 1950-1970." Working paper 76-7, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Havens, A. Eugene
1965 "Social Factors in Economic Development." Paper 5, Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1965 "Education in Rural Colombia: An Investment in Human Resources." Paper 8, Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1971 "Income, Employment and Occupation Structure in the small farm sector of Colombia." Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1973 "A Longitudinal Analysis of three small farm communities in Colombia: A compenduum of descriptive statistics." Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Havens, A. Eugene, and William L. Flinn
1975 "Structural determinants of the selectivity of migration in a declining economic area." Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Bruce Laybourne
1977 "The Wisconsin Deer Hunter: Social Characteristics, Attitudes, and Preferences for Proposed Hunting Season Changes." Center for Resource Policy Studies, Working Paper No. 10, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Heberlein, Thomas A., Daniel Linz, Keith Warriner and Pam Rathbun
1980 "Qualitative Report of Customer Reaction to Time-of-Day Pricing." Sociological Report No. 4, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Heberlein, Thomas A., Bonnie Ortiz and Daniel Linz
1980 "Attitudes and Reported Behaviors of Customers on a Mandatory Participation Time-of-Day Electricity Pricing Experiment." Sociological Report No. 3, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Jerry Vaske
1979 "Apostle Islands Visitor in 1975." Center for Resource Policy Studies, Working Paper No. 11, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Heberlein, Thomas A. and Keith Warriner
1978 "Appliance Saturation, Housing and Demographic Characteristics of Residential Customers." Sociological Report No. 1. Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

1979 "Predicting Household Energy Consumption in Time-of-Day Experimental Households During the Baseline Year." Sociological Report No. 2, Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Hogan, Joanne, and Marta Tienda
1978 "Zinacanteco women: prediction for change in a Mexican village." Paper 120, Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Hough, Richard L., E.M. Beck, and G.F. Summers
1972 "Status inconsistency: a two-step regression approach." Rural Industrial Development 72.10, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Hough, Richard L., and Gene F. Summers
1970 "Structural Stress and Psychological Impairment." Rural Industrial Development 70.1, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Johnson, Doyle and Gene F. Summers
1971 "Industrial development and goal modification in church congregations." Rural Industrial Development 71.2, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Kelley, Jonathan, Archibald O. Haller, and David B. Bills
1979 "Economic development and the wages of the working class." Working Papers in Sociology, Research School of Social Sciences, The Australian National University, Canberra.

McGranahan, David, Eugene A. Wilkening, Jon Hutchinson, and Charles Geisler
1975 "The use of leader ratings to assess community services and characteristics in the Kickapoo Valley." Report 45, Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Olson, Mary B., David B. Bills, and Archibald O. Haller
1979 "The measurement of political and income aspirations and expectations." ERIC-CRESS microfiche. Las Cruces: New Mexico State University.

Olson, Mary B., and Archibald O. Haller
1978 "Political participation in a rural area." ERIC-CRESS microfiche. Las Cruces: New Mexico State University.

Rojas, Alicia, and Marta Tienda
1979 "Dependency rates in peasant economies: theoretical considerations and alternative measures." Working Paper 79-33, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Rojek, Dean, Frank Clemente and Gene F. Summers
1974 "Community Satisfaction in a Rural Setting." Rural Industrial Development 74.11, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Seiler, Lauren H. and G.F. Summers
1972 "On the relationship between physiological malaise and psychological symptoms of stress: a male-female comparison." Rural Industrial Development 72.5, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Slesinger, Doris P. M. McDivitt, and J. Moorman
1977 "Sociodemographic Factors and Food Patterns Affecting the Nutritive Quality of Diets in an Urban Community." Working Paper 77-14, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Slesinger, Doris P. and Eileen Muirragui
1979 "Migrant agricultural labor in Wisconsin: a short history." Discussion Paper No. 565-79, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Slesinger, Doris P., and Harry P. Travis
1975 "A study of infant mortality in Wisconsin, 1969 from linked birth and death records: an application of log-linear models." Working Paper 75-15, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Summers, Gene F.
1971 "Field Manual for the Industrial Development Project." Rural Industrial Development 71.3, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1974 "A Social System Perspective of Rural Industrial Development." Rural Industrial Development 74.4, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Summers, Gene F. and E.M. Beck
1972 "Industrial development and urbanization: a U.S. case." Rural Industrial Development 72.8, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Summers, Gene F. and Frank Clemente
1973 "Rapid industrial development, competition and relative economic status: a study in human ecology." Rural Industrial Development 73.10, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Summers, Gene F., Sharon Evans and Jon Minkoff
1975 "Rural Industrial Development Bibliography." Rural Industrial Development 75.1, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Summers, Gene F., Richard L. Hough and Dean Rojek
1972 "Basic Scale Documentation." Rural Industrial Development 72.3, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Tienda, Marta
1977 "Demographic translation and dependency: implications of the disaggregation issue for population policy in Peru." Working Paper 78-12, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1980 "Regional Differentiation, Intraindustry Division of Labor and Family Labor Supply in Peru." Working Paper 80-12, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Tienda, Marta and Osei-Mensa Aborampah
1979 "Energy related adaptations in low income nonmetropolitan Wisconsin counties." Discussion Paper No. 560-79, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Voss, Paul R.
1977 "Social determinants of age at first marriage in the United States." Working Paper 77-46, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Voss, Paul R. and Balkrishna Kale
1977 "Small area population estimates in Wisconsin: an examination of the relative accuracy of estimate derived from three symptomatic data files." Working Paper 77-47, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The **Research Division** of the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison, publishes this information in support of its programs and provides equal opportunities in employment, programming and admission. Single copies of this publication are available from the Department of Rural Sociology, 1450 Linden Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

Published December, 1983

BEST COPY AVAILABLE